



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BP 302.16.4

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

FROM THE
George Schünemann Jackson
FUND

FOR THE PURCHASE OF BOOKS ON
SOCIAL WELFARE & MORAL PHILOSOPHY



GIVEN IN HONOR OF HIS PARENTS, THEIR SIMPLICITY
SINCERITY AND FEARLESSNESS

THE
BRITISH • CRITIC,
QUARTERLY
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,
AND
Ecclesiastical Record.

VOLUME XX.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;
AND
SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND
MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1836.

^A
BP 302.16.4
✓



Jackson Fund

LONDON :

PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH AND SONS, BELL-YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

4574
50-64
3-2

INDEX OF BOOKS REVIEWED,

OR

NOTICED IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

•* For Remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, and Ecclesiastical Record, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

A.

A Few Words addressed to the Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Chapters, and generally to the Members of the Church of England, (By a Lay Episcopalian,) 232.

An Elementary Course of Theological Lectures, by the Rev. W. D. Conybeare, M. A. 363.

A Selection of Psalms and Hymns, intended chiefly for Public Worship, 417.

Anderson (Rev. James S. M.), *The People of God called upon to build the House of Prayer*, (A Sermon,) 199.

B.

Blunt (Rev. John J.), *A Sketch of the Church in the First Two Centuries after Christ*, (Sermons,) 113.

Broughton (Rev. W. G.), *The present Position and Duties of the Church of England*, (A Sermon,) 1

Browne (Sir Thomas), his Works, including his Life and Correspondence, 134.

Buckland (Dr.), *Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology*, 295.

Burton (Dr.), *The History of the Christian Church, from the Ascension of Christ to the Conversion of Constantine*, 309.

C.

Chalmers (Dr.), *New Edition of his Works*, 257.

Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Dublin and Glandelagh, in 1836, by Richard Whately, D.D. Archbishop of Dublin, 475.

Church and Home Melodies, by the Rev. Thomas James Judkin, 417.

VOL. XX.

Colquhoun (J. C. Esq.), *Ireland. Popery and Priestcraft the cause of Misery and Crime*, 1.

Conybeare (Rev. W. D.), *An Elementary Course of Theological Lectures*, 363.

Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America, by Rev. Francis L. Hawks, 261.

D.

Dale (Rev. Thomas), *Probation for the Christian Ministry practically considered*, (Four Sermons,) 113.

Dodsworth (Rev. W.), *A Sermon in behalf of the Bishop of London's Proposal*, 199.

E.

Eden (Rev. Robert), *The Unity of the Church in her Communion and Ministry*, (Two Sermons,) 113.

G.

Gilbert's Lectures on the Atonement, 258.

Greswell (Rev. W.), *A Commentary on the Order for the Burial of the Dead, &c.* 134.

H.

Hale (Rev. W. H.), *Abridgement of Jeremy Taylor on Prayer*, 258.

Hawks (Rev. Francis L.), *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America*, 261.

History of the Christian Church, from the Ascension of Jesus Christ to the Conversion of Constantine, 209.

History of the English Episcopacy, &c. by the Rev. Thomas Lathbury, M.A. 329.

Houghton (Wm.), *Calvinism Scripturally examined and refuted*, 492.

a 2

Howe (John, M.A.), *The Life and Character of, with an Analysis of his Writings*, 84.

I.

Ireland. Popery and Priestcraft the cause of Misery and Crime, 1.

J.

Journey through Arabia Petræa to Mount Sinai and the excavated City of Petra, the Edom of Prophecies, by M. Léon de Laborde, 446.

K.

Keble (Mr.), *New Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, 491.

Kurze Geschichte der Päpste, Von D. Wilhelm Smets, 50.

L.

Laborde (M. Léon de), *Journey through Arabia Petræa to Mount Sinai, and the excavated City of Petra*, 446.

Lathbury (Rev. Thomas), *A History of the English Episcopacy, from the period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity*, 329.

M.

Maynooth in 1834, (by E. F. O'Beirne, late Student of Maynooth College,) 1.

Melville (Rev. Henry), *Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge*, 113.

N.

Natural Theology, considered with reference to Lord Brougham's Discourse on that subject, 27.

Noel (Rev. B. W.), *The Spiritual Claims of the Metropolis*, (A Sermon,) 199.

O.

O'Beirne (E. F.), *Account of Maynooth College*, 1.

Ogilvie (Rev. Charles A.), *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford*, 350.

P.

Physical Theory of another Life. By the Author of the *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, 403.

Probation for the Christian Ministry, practically considered, 113.

Proposals for the Creation of a Fund to be applied to the Building and Endowment of Additional Churches in the Metropolis. By the Lord Bishop of London, 199.

Proposals for rendering the Church Estab-

lishment Efficient. By a Country Clergyman, 232.

Psalms and Hymns, adapted to the Service of the Church of England, 40.

R.

Rogers (H.), *The Life and Character of John Howe, M.A., with an Analysis of his Writings*, 84.

S.

Scobell (Rev. Edward), *Psalms and Hymns*, 417.

Smets (Von D. Wilhelm), *Kurze Geschichte der Päpste*, 50.

T.

The Brothers' Controversy, being a genuine Correspondence between a Clergyman of the Church of England and a Layman of Unitarian Opinions, 166.

The Divine Glory Manifested in the Conduct and Discourses of Our Lord, (Sermons by the Rev. C. A. Ogilvie,) 350.

The National Church Re-adjusted: a charge delivered to the Clergy of the County of Nottingham, (By Archdeacon Wilkins,) 232.

The People of God called upon to Build the House of Prayer, (A Sermon,) 199.

The Present Position and Duties of the Church of England, (A Sermon,) 1.

The Roman Schism illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church, (By the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval,) 426.

The Spiritual Claims of the Metropolis, (A Sermon,) 199.

Turton (Dr.), *Natural Theology considered with reference to Lord Brougham's Discourse on that subject*, 27.

U.

Unity of the Church in her Communion and Ministry, (Two Sermons,) 113.

V.

Villers, on the Reformation of Luther, 250.

W.

Whately (Richard, D.D.), *Archbishop of Dublin, Charge to his Clergy in 1836*, 475.

Wilkin (Simon), his Edition of the Works of Sir Thomas Browne, 134.

Wilkins (Dr., Archdeacon), a Charge to the Clergy of the County of Nottingham, 232.

Wiseman (Dr.), *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practice of the [Roman] Catholic Church*, 373.

C O N T E N T S

OF

No. XXXIX.



	PAGE.
ART. I. 1. Maynooth in 1834. By E. F. O'Beirne, late Student of Maynooth College.	
2. Ireland. Popery and Priestcraft the cause of Misery and Crime. By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq.	
3. The present Position and Duties of the Church of England: A Sermon preached in Canterbury Cathedral, &c. &c. By W. G. Broughton, M.A.	1
II. Natural Theology considered with reference to Lord Brougham's Discourse on that Subject. By T. Turton, D.D. Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Dean of Peterborough	27
III. Psalms and Hymns adapted to the Services of the Church of England	40
IV. Kurze Geschichte der Päpste ; nebst einem Anhang über den Primat Petri und das Märchen von der Päpstinn Johanna. Von D. Wilhelm Smets	50
V. The Life and Character of John Howe, M.A., with an Analysis of his Writings. By H. Rogers	84
VI. 1. Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in February, 1836 ; to which are added, Two Sermons preached in Great St. Mary's, at the Evening Lecture. By Henry Melvill, M.A.	

2. Probation for the Christian Ministry practically considered. Four Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge, in March, 1836. By Rev. Thomas Dale, M.A.
 3. The Unity of the Church in her Communion and Ministry. Two Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in March and April, 1836. By Rev. Robert Eden, M.A.
 4. A Sketch of the Church of the First Two Centuries after Christ, drawn from the Writings of the Fathers down to Clemens Alexandrinus inclusive, in a Course of Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in January, 1836. By Rev. John J. Blunt 113
- VII. 1. A Commentary on the Order for the Burial of the Dead, &c. By Rev. W. Greswell, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and Curate of Disley, Cheshire.
2. Sir Thomas Browne's Works, including his Life and Correspondence. Edited by Simon Wilkin, F.L.S. (The Hydriotaphia, or Urn Burial, and the Brampton Urns)..... 134
- VIII. The Brothers' Controversy, being a genuine Correspondence between a Clergyman of the Church of England and a Layman of Unitarian Opinions..... 166
- IX. 1. Proposals for the creation of a Fund to be applied to the Building and Endowment of Additional Churches in the Metropolis. By Charles James Lord Bishop of London.
2. The People of God called upon to build the House of Prayer; a Sermon preached at St. Peter's, Colchester. By Rev. James S. M. Anderson.

ART.	PAGE.
3. The Spiritual Claims of the Metropolis, a Sermon. By Rev. Baptist Wriothesly Noel.	
4. A Sermon in behalf of the Bishop of London's Pro- posal. By Rev. W. Dodsworth.....	199
X. The History of the Christian Church, from the Ascension of Jesus Christ to the Conversion of Constantine. By Rev. Edward Burton, D.D.	209
XI. 1. The National Church Re-adjusted: A Charge deli- vered to the Clergy of the County of Nottingham, in June, 1836, at the Annual Visitation of the Venera- ble Archdeacon Wilkins, D.D.	
2. Proposals for rendering the Church Establishment Efficient. By a Country Clergyman.	
3. A few Words addressed to the Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Chapters, and generally to the Members of the Church of England. By a Lay Episcopalian	232

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.	250
--------------------------------	-----

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JULY, 1836.

- ART. I.—1. *Maynooth in 1834.* By Eugene Francis O'Beirne, late Student of Maynooth College. Dublin. 1835.
2. *Ireland. Popery and Priestcraft the Cause of Misery and Crime.* By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq. of Killermont, Glasgow.
3. *The present Position and Duties of the Church of England: A Sermon preached in Canterbury Cathedral, &c. &c.* By William Grant Broughton, M. A., Archdeacon of New South Wales. London. 1835.

WE have placed at the head of this paper the pamphlet of Eugene Francis O'Beirne, because it professes to tell us a great deal about the College of Maynooth—a subject, respecting which every Protestant, who is at all in earnest, must be impatiently desirous of information. And Mr. O'Beirne *does* tell us a great deal. But, unfortunately, there is one awkward circumstance, which tends to impair most grievously the value of his testimony. Mr. O'Beirne was expelled from Maynooth College!—for what reason we are altogether ignorant; and the writer declares himself to be quite as ignorant as we. He complains bitterly that he was removed by the arm of “bare-faced power,” and that no application or effort on his part has hitherto been sufficient to extort from the collegiate authorities any statement of the delinquency for which he was driven away. We have no thought whatever of questioning the truth of his allegation. For anything that we know to the contrary, he may have been the victim of caprice and tyranny. He may have been goaded by such oppression as makes “wise men mad.” But, even wise men, while the madness is upon them, are not, by any means, the most desirable and trustworthy of witnesses, *anent* the sayings and doings of their persecutors. And, therefore, without the slightest disposition to impeach the integrity of the informant, we must frankly pro-

nounce it to be the duty of all prudent and honest men to listen to his charges with considerably more than ordinary caution.

But, further,—we must venture upon the freedom of doubting whether the wisdom of Mr. O'Beirne, even if it had never been disturbed by oppression, would have been sufficiently commanding to secure the confidence of the public, on his appearance before them as the censor of a great public institution. His statements are put forth, not only in the temper of exasperation which may have been inspired by a sense of wrong, but also, for the most part, in a style of dictatorial arrogance, and sometimes, of coarse, but vapid and feeble jocularity. All this is deeply to be lamented. He has been within the *penetralia* of this establishment; and his personal acquaintance with the system might have given a high value to his testimony, if it had been delivered in a tone of modest and dispassionate intelligence. As it is, to say the least, one is strongly tempted to distrust his judgment. One cannot help feeling that it would be scarcely righteous to condemn the establishment, or its conductors, purely on the strength of depositions which manifest so little either of the spirit of charity or of a sound mind.

We trust that we shall not be misunderstood. It will scarcely, we suppose, be suspected that we entertain any profound admiration for the College of Maynooth! On the contrary, we have always been in the habit of regarding it as a nursery of feelings and of principles inveterately and rancorously hostile to every thing that is called Protestant. From the very nature of the Institution, it cannot well be otherwise. Nevertheless, we must repeat, that the voice of its accuser would have been incomparably more “potential,” in confirming our opinions, if it had been somewhat more gentle and subdued; and, above all, if it had been uttered by one who had no personal injuries to redress.

The substance of his arraignment is comprised in the following paragraphs:—

“I denounce the system pursued in Maynooth, both as it regards mental instruction and moral discipline. I denounce it as at variance with the best interests of the state. I denounce it as directly opposed to the constitution of the British empire, upon the inborn and secured rights of a portion of whose subjects it is a never-ceasing infringement. I denounce it as the perpetuator of monkish prejudices, and monkish hostility to tolerant and philanthropic views. I denounce it as the fomentor of bigotry—as an enemy to the diffusion of light—as a drag-chain upon the intellectual movement. I denounce its internal government, as contemning the code of laws originally agreed upon between the trustees and the legislature for the regulation of the establishment—as having invented and acted upon a set of arbitrary and cruel regulations, unsanctioned by the laws—inflicting capricious punishment—violating the

common constitution of Great Britain and Ireland, by which a fair trial is secured, and the accuser is confronted with the accused; and as setting up in its stead a cruel Dagon, the work of their own hands—an Inquisitional tribunal in the heart of a free country. I denounce it as not only conniving at, but encouraging the infamous trade of the spy and the informer, and selecting by preference, from those who have sustained such a character, the most persevering and most unprincipled, as the worthiest members of the priesthood, and the most befitting guardians of the people's morals. I denounce them as incompetent, some of them from sheer lack of intellect, and others from a total absence of all dignity of character and enlightenment of views, to hold the reins of government in an institution of such vast importance, and to preside over the education of the future Roman Catholic clergy and hierarchy of Ireland.

“ This is strong language, but it is no more than the simple and unvarnished truth. The breast of every man who has received his education in Maynooth College, will, when he reads this statement, beat responsively to the just feeling of indignation which I have attempted to convey. If he look back to the period of his leaving the walls of that institution—his *Sæva*, not his *Alma Mater*—whether he left it bearing his credentials as a Roman Catholic priest, or as a layman, he will recollect, with a shudder, the tyranny from whose jaws he then escaped; and while he reflects upon that moment, and confesses it to have been the happiest of his life, he will acknowledge the accuracy of the picture which I have attempted to draw.”—pp. 19, 20.

With this extract we shall dismiss the pamphlet of Mr. O'Beirne; adding only this one suggestion,—that, although his allegations are by no means to be received as conclusive evidence, they may safely and advantageously be resorted to, as a manual of instructions, to direct the investigations of other persons, who may, at any time, be authorized to ascertain the condition and the tendency of this formidable Institution.

We now proceed to Mr. Colquhoun, of Killermont. This gentleman, it appears, has swept away from before him the huge pile of conflicting statements, with which a multitude of interested parties have, from time to time, loaded and perplexed the inquiry; and has, very wisely, betaken himself to the vast body of facts, collected by five Parliamentary Committees, who have sat on the State of Ireland since the year 1825, and have published five folio volumes of Evidence. From this enormous mass of documents he has extracted very cogent proof of the following propositions; that the disorders of Ireland are miserably aggravated by the influence of Roman Catholic *agitators* and *priests*; that, by this influence, the lives and property of Protestants are placed in constant danger; and that tranquillity and order are confined, for the most part, to those quarters in which the Protestants predominate. We can very confidently recommend these statements to the serious attention of the public. They seem to us to be the

result of patient, righteous, and dispassionate investigation. There is about them nothing which leads to the suspicion that they are the report of one who was seeking for matter of condemnation, and was, at all events, resolved to find it. In speaking of the Romish priesthood, for instance, he does not, after the manner of some, rush into fierce and truculent reprobation of the whole body, as a brotherhood of selfish and remorseless impostors, a band of willing conspirators against virtue, liberty, and order. He proclaims, on the contrary, that there are among them many simple-minded and honest men, who are infinitely better than the cause with which they happen unfortunately to be connected. Mr. Shiel, however, has been pleased to affirm, on the other hand, that "the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland are the best, the purest, and the most zealous clerical body in the Christian world"—a proposition which, we opine, he will never establish to the satisfaction of any reasoning man, unless he can first contrive to drown the five folios of Parliamentary Evidence "deeper than did ever plummet sound."

The first thing that must strike every one, on examining the extracts produced by Mr. Colquhoun, is the disastrous fact, that, potent as this zealous body have been represented for good, they are, beyond all comparison, more potent for evil. Their influence, in all matters clearly connected with religion, is notoriously paramount and irresistible. But it would appear that, the instant the priest steps beyond the circle of his spiritual function, to interfere with the business of life, and to arrest the political madness of the people,—that instant, the spell deserts him, and he goes forth merely as a common man. In the confessional, at the altar, in the sick and dying chamber, he is invested with an overpowering and superhuman majesty. With a word he can lift up, or cast down, the stoutest heart. He appears before men, as one who, literally, holds the keys of heaven. But let him attempt to bring the message of peace into the midst of a band of midnight conspirators, or an infuriate multitude bent on spoil, incendiarism and blood, and he finds himself suddenly bereft of all power and dignity. He is in danger of being scowled at, as an emissary of oppression, and a traitor to his people. The sword of spiritual rule suddenly becomes "all too massy for his strength, and will not be uplifted." He might, indeed, threaten the plunderers and assassins with suspension from the sacraments of the Church. But the probable consequence of his temerity would be, a burst of frantic indignation against him for a tyrannical abuse of his sacerdotal powers. The sacredness of his person and his office would, for a time, be utterly forgotten. Godlike as he is, he would speedily be doomed to learn that his worshippers bear a

strong resemblance to the devout and superstitious savage, who flogs his idol whenever it displeases him. Even the Protestant parson is scarcely more an object of aversion and of persecution, than a loyal and pacific priest!

Now this occasional exposure of weakness—this public desecration of himself—this open descent to the ordinary level of humanity—is more than the best-disposed of the Irish priests are long able to endure. They feel—for they have many of them avowed as much—that the success of their exertions in the cause of order and obedience is at all times extremely doubtful; and they know that every instance of failure shears off a lock from the temples of the Nazarite, and robs him of a portion of his strength. Like wary and prudent wizards, therefore, they abstain from all fruitless attempts to allay the winds, when the tempest is abroad in all the fulness of its irresistible might. They look on—reluctantly and sorrowfully, perhaps, but still inertly and passively—while murder and pillage are in full revelry around them. When the neighbourhood of the Priest of Ballyheagh was distracted with atrocities perpetrated by contending factions, he refused to interfere, because, truly, “it would have diminished his “influence with his flock.” In 1832 there was an illegal combination against the rents of the Duke of Buckingham. One might have expected that a member of “the best, the purest, and “most zealous clerical body in the Christian world,” would, at once, have planted himself in the breach between the law and its assailants. But, no! The priest himself, Mr. Burke, declares that he did no such thing; for “if he had positively opposed the “attack, he might find that his influence, upon that and other “subjects, might be very weak.”—*Colquhoun*, p. 19.

But, if the priesthood in Ireland are thus, comparatively, powerless as auxiliaries to the law, what tongue can tell, what heart can conceive, their terrific omnipotence, as enemies to the law! If the spiritual power mutters out of the dust, when it speaks of quiet and submission, it thunders from the heights of heaven, when it speaks of resistance and of insurrection. Its accents of peace are drowned by the yell of popular and desperate fury. But when its voice mingles, in dreadful harmony, with the outcry of exasperated multitudes, the sound thereof goes forth to the ends of the land, proclaiming woe and desolation to every individual, and to every institution, which stands in the way for an adversary against the march of rebellion. The destructive confederacy becomes at once a holy crusade. The sufferers in the warfare against tithes are virtually exalted to the honours of martyrdom. The Protestants are not only a band of invaders and usurpers, but a proscribed and accursed race, hate-

ful to God and man. And the dissolution of a union with the sacrilegious and heretical Saxon, becomes a blessed consummation, to which the vows and the energies of the faithful ought incessantly to be directed.

That such is at least the *tendency* of priestly interference, whenever it allies itself with the turbulent passions, and fierce discontents, of the Romish population, is a matter, we presume, sufficiently notorious and manifest to all who collect their knowledge merely from the current intelligence of the time. But it stands out, in all the bold relief of a substantial and appalling fact, before the face of those who laboriously consult the records compiled by the legislature for our information. And let no man imagine that we insist on this, in a spirit of railing and vindictive crimination. From the very same documents, which tell us of these dreadful things, we likewise learn, that, if a large portion of the Irish priesthood are now enlisted in the battle of political agitation, there are many among them who have been actually driven into the ranks; and this, after an honest and vigorous, but ineffectual struggle, against the degradation of such ruffian warfare. There are, scattered through the folios of parliamentary evidence, instances which show that the better feelings of the body frequently shrunk back from an unholy alliance with the apostles of sedition. But the tide was far too mighty for them either to roll back, or to resist. They could no longer buffet the angry billows, with any hope of escaping destruction; and, accordingly, they were fain to swim with the overpowering torrent. In the parish of Castle Pollard, for instance, the people were bitterly incensed against their priest, because, though "he was a very good man, *he was a bad man for his parishioners;*" in other words, because he refused to prostitute his sacred function to the encouragement of insubordination. The general cry, nearly throughout the country, was, that no priest should be upheld who would not lend his authority to designs of outrage and disorder. Among the instruments for bearing down the reluctance of the secular clergy, was the meddling activity of the friars; who, conformably to their immemorial usage, were incessantly on the watch for the unpopularity of the parish priest, and were ready to rush into his parish, and to seize upon his dues, and to ruin his influence and usefulness. And, instances might be produced, where the people themselves carried their threat of revolt from their local minister into savage execution; and where many moderate and upright individuals of the clerical body were exposed to every species of injustice, insult, and persecution. The result was just what might reasonably have been anticipated. In 1824, when the great Catholic question was in agitation, the

priesthood were halting between two opinions; and many of their number kept aloof from the work of social and political distraction. By the year 1830, all their scruples had been dismissed or smothered; and, when another "theme was thrown out for insurrection's arguing," the priests were the foremost and the hottest in the conflict. Then came Dr. Doyle's Letter against tithes. Then came the denunciations from the altar. Then were the Romish chapels repeatedly polluted and profaned by scenes of brutal violence and tumult, which made religion weep.* And thenceforward, too, did Irish murders, from their horrible frequency, come to be regarded almost as *solemn* occurrences; and to excite, by the wearisome iteration and monotony of crime, but little more attention, than the list of promotions, or the catalogue of bankruptcies!

About this period, too, another element of discord had intimately mixed itself with the spreading mass of evil. The College of Maynooth was established, if we recollect right, in the year 1795; and, in 1824, the credulous policy which had sown the wind, began, in ample measure, to reap the whirlwind. We have been somewhat slow to receive the representations of Mr. O'Beirne, relative to this monument of national *liberality*. But there is other testimony in abundance, besides his, before us. We learn from Mr. Wyse that, in 1824, when the Catholic Association was beginning to trouble the waters, and to lash them into fury, there were in Ireland two classes of priests. There were the older clergy, for the most part educated abroad, and, in general, men of cultivated minds, and gentle manners; desirous of avoiding all secular collision, and willing, if it were possible, to live peaceably with all men. On the other hand, there was a large infusion of a very different material, which had been carefully prepared within the walls of the domestic Institution. The disciples of Maynooth, (if we may trust the accounts here presented to us,) from whatever cause, were found to be much unlike their elder brethren. They were keen politicians, and excellent conductors of the electric element which was then fearfully accumulating in the political atmosphere. And, when it was finally resolved that the Romish hierarchy of Ireland should be forced into solemn league and covenant with the *patriotism* of the day, the younger priests, who had all been educated at home, were mostly found to be in a state of surprising aptitude for the adventure; and were, accordingly, exalted into commanding popularity: while all, of whatever sort, who were backward in the glorious cause, were, gradually, frightened, or goaded, or starved

* See Colquhoun, p. 24, &c.

into compliance. It seems that the bishops, as being of the old school, were the last to give way. Dr. Doyle, himself, is known to have resisted long; but even he was, at length, compelled to perceive that his influence, however potent it might be in the work of excitement, was altogether powerless for the purposes of restraint. The result was, that the authority of the prelates was, in time, brought to bear, with all its weight, upon the sluggish and the refractory; till, at length, nearly the whole clerical body was formed into one tremendous agency of disaffection. After the struggle of 1824, the priests became, very generally, the collectors for the Association; and no less than 2600 of them enrolled themselves among its members, with twenty bishops and four archbishops at their head. The services of the same body of *publicans*, at the present hour, as gatherers of the O'Connell tribute, is a matter perfectly notorious throughout the empire.

See, then, what is the condition of the Romish priesthood in that wretched country! They live under a perpetual, and almost irresistible, temptation, to become political incendiaries! Every one remembers the crowd-compelling game of football, in the Caliph Vathek. Now, the football is abroad in Ireland: and it would seem as if Eblis himself presided over the sport. The priests, for a time, may stand aloof from the pursuit; but, one after the other, the madness seizes upon them: till, at last, they are found to be foremost in the infernal struggle. And hence it is that, (as Mr. Colquhoun suggests,) to the eyes of peaceable men, the country presents an image of Pandemonium, where the "vassals of perdition" vex, and torment, and lacerate each other. The worst and most wicked "have the land in empire"—the ministers of religion are, at once, their spiritual lords and their political slaves—superstition is almost compelled to minister to crime—and clouds of stormy hatred and dissension mingle with the incense which rises from the altar. The plague is creeping about in darkness, and the demon is walking abroad at noon-day. All this while, the Protestants are marked out for extermination; and the downfall of the heretical church is now no longer in the distance of the picture which is constantly before the eyes of every faithful *Catholic*. "Boys," exclaimed Priest Burke from his altar, "Boys, the tottering fabric of heresy is falling, and the *Catholic Church* is rising in glory. Ireland was once *Catholic*—it *shall* be *Catholic* again."

Every reader of this Journal must be distinctly aware that it professes to see but little either of charity or wisdom in the proceedings of fierce haranguers, or cyclical rhapsodists, who go about the country—(it may be with righteous and benevolent intent)—to enlighten the people of England, by throwing a glare of lurid

torch-light upon the atrocities of Romanism. But, nevertheless, we hold, on the other hand, that it would argue nothing short of downright judicial infatuation, to close our eyes against the *sun-light*, which is rushing in upon us, from a vast collection of irrefragable *facts*. It may be true that Popery is not in a state of *relative* increase, either in England or in Ireland. It may be true—(though this is rather a heavy demand on our credulity)—that the theology of Peter Dens, and the ethics of Maynooth, are mere literary or ecclesiastical curiosities, and not the guides and manuals of living men. It may be true,—(or it may, for the present, be left undisputed,)—that the Church of Rome is immutable in theory alone, while the life and spirit has departed from her: that she is unchangeable, just as the petrification of a man would be unchangeable; retaining, rigidly, the original form, although the vitality is gone. It may be true that the day of the Dominics and the Torquemadas, the Gardiners and the Bonners, is departed for ever,—that it is but a poor and sorry fancy to brood over the probable return of the horrors of Smithfield,—and that to look forward to the ferocity of a future Inquisition, is to see with the eye of childhood, and to fear “a painted devil.” All this *may* possibly be true. But, let the confidence, with which all this is frequently asserted, be what it may, it can never cause the truth, which is written in these parliamentary folios, “to pale its ineffectual fire.” And these folios,—illustrated as they are, day after day, by the perpetual commentary of Irish affairs—show, with irresistible cogency, that *the day of vengeance is in the heart* of Papal Ireland; that she is prepared, if need be, to plead her cause by violence and blood; and that her priesthood,—whether willingly or by compulsion,—must inevitably be foremost in this strife, whenever it may come. We say not this for the purpose of spreading panic-terror (the most blind and cruel of all passions) among our own people. We speak it rather in sorrow than in anger. We declare it, not to rouse the fury, but to awaken the vigilance, of our countrymen. We proclaim it, in order that,—if we have a deadly struggle to encounter,—we may encounter it in the open day; with a full and clear understanding of our position, and the perils which environ it: so that, if the evil hour should arrive, it may not spring suddenly upon us, *like an armed man*, while we are solacing ourselves with visions of peace, and liberality, and conciliation.

How it is that things have fallen into this miserable condition, (whether “by folly, or by fate,” by long misgovernment, or by some strange peculiarity of national temperament, or by all these and many other causes working together), it would now be idle and fruitless to inquire. The phenomena are before us. The

advantage of physical exemption from noxious creations, proverbially ascribed to Ireland, is, somehow or other, most calamitously overbalanced by an abundant and pernicious growth of moral venom. A dreadful and complicated disease is corroding "the bowels of the land;" and, of that disease, the mighty agitator himself is rather a symptom, than a cause; though, like other symptomatic affections, his virulence may aggravate the malady, and protract its cure, or tend to render it utterly incurable. "Whether he be man or devil"—(to use the language of his Majesty's prime minister,)—whether he be "a spirit of health or goblin damned," Daniel O'Connell is, after all, but the creature of the times; though a creature who may greatly exasperate the misery and the confusion by which he was engendered. Those "yelling monsters" who were the progeny of Sin and Death, are perpetually preying upon the mother that bred them, so "that rest or intermission finds she none." And thus it is with political agitators of every description, whether they be laymen, or whether they be priests. The entrails of the parent who bore them, supply them with their foul repast. And there is little hope that *she* will find either "rest or intermission," unless some means can be discovered of muzzling or pacifying their "wide, Cerberean mouths." But this is a task which, hitherto, has baffled all our legislative benevolence and sagacity. Cake after cake, medicated with opiates and honey, has been cast before them and eagerly devoured. But still the brood are as wakeful and as ravenous as ever? Nay, "increase of appetite has grown by what it fed on." And, at present, such is the *Bulimia*, that we are utterly unable to conceive what prey will ever assuage it, unless the whole body of Irish Protestantism,—Church, property, every thing,—be tossed into their jaws!

It is notorious, indeed, that in the moment of every concession made to the *Catholics* of Ireland, there was always a stunning chorus of grateful profession. And, of the sincerity of these effusions there cannot be any reasonable doubt,—provided always, that we adopt the well-known definition of *gratitude*; viz. a profound and lively sense of *future* favours. And so long as any thing remains to be granted, the *gratitude* of the petitioners will, of course, be inexhaustible. We, ourselves, have seen a tiger at Exeter Change crouch and fawn under the hand of his feeder, when his supper was just about to be thrown into his cage; and the same symptoms of *mansuetude* would, naturally, occur at every meal!

After all, however, these strange obliquities ought not, perhaps, much to astonish us, when we consider the manifold and peculiar infelicities which have been, for ages, besetting that ill-fated land. And, among these infelicities, we cannot but reckon the fatality

which, to this hour, has disabled her from enjoying the full *benefits* of the principle of freedom. A people must be most disastrously circumstanced, to which the British Constitution is a curse rather than a blessing. And yet—atrocious as the opinion may be deemed by some—we do, with a deep intensity of conviction, believe that this is the simple case with Ireland! We are eternally reminded that, in other parts of Europe, the most perfect equality of civil rights has been granted to Protestants and Romanists; and that nothing but *peace and good will* has been the result of this triumph of liberality. Be it so. But, be it likewise kept in mind, that, in those blessed regions of *peace and good will*, both Protestants and Romanists are all under the constant and overpowering pressure of a despotic domination. Only let any one figure to himself a Romish Priest, in Austria or in Prussia, denouncing, from his altar, this individual as a traitor, and that individual as an apostate—forbidding his people to do any farming labour for one, or stigmatising another as “*a miscreant to be hunted out of the country.*” In short, only let us imagine any minister of religion, in those kingdoms, daring to blow the trumpet of anarchy from the sanctuary of God. Will any intelligent person among us pretend to doubt what would be the fate of the incendiary? Does any man believe that this detestable abuse of the sacerdotal office would enjoy one day’s impunity? And, further, will any one venture to affirm that this beautiful and millennial display of *peace and good will* would have a year’s duration, if the arm of absolute power were to be lifted off? Now, in Ireland, we know, the arm of absolute power can never be *laid on*. She forms an integral and most important section of the British empire; and, therefore, she *must* be admitted to a participation in the privileges of our British institutions. But what is the consequence? Why, obviously, that they who hold the keys of heaven, hold likewise the prerogative of *binding and loosing* in all secular and civil matters. They virtually have the power of absolving their people from the duty of obedience to the law; and, not only so, but of proclaiming, if it so please them, with irresistible authority, the religious duty of disobedience and insurrection. Tithes, rent, the exercise of the elective franchise, all are at their mercy! And if any member of our legislature should presume to hint the necessity of controlling this prostitution of priestly influence, he would, instantly, be hooted down, as a violator of the rights of conscience; as a narrow-minded, meddling bigot, intent upon the abridgment of religious freedom; in short, as a traitor to the liberties of the human race.

Now, let it not be imagined that we are here contending for the

introduction of despotic power into the administration of Ireland. What we *are* contending for is, the necessity of discerning the absence of all analogy between the cases of Continental Catholicism and Irish Catholicism. We are contending for the manifest absurdity of the notion, that a scheme of gentleness and liberality is attended with no dangers here, because it may be found to be innocent and safe abroad. We maintain that, in our political system, the effect of priestly agitation is, as if the disturbing forces in the planetary system should be sufficiently potent to work a ruinous counteraction to the predominance of the central body. How this evil is to be corrected, is another question; a question which hardly will be thought to lie within our province. But, still, we may affirm that nothing but an aggravation of the mischief can arise from our remaining in stupid and contented ignorance of the existence of the evil.

And is not the evil deadly to the peace and prosperity of Ireland? What would be the probable result if the destinies of Ireland were, at this moment, wielded by a paternal and enlightened, but yet a military despotism. Under such a government, the amplest indulgence might be allowed to every form and variety of purely theological opinion. But no set of opinions would be considered as entitled to the immunity of pure theological belief, if it should be converted into an instrument for distracting and convulsing the realm from one end of it to the other. A mere creed, as such, might be invested with the fullest and most liberal protection. But, if the creed should assume the tone and bearing of an armed and aggressive doctrine, it would, at once, be treated, and justly treated, as an institute of rebellion. And how would the people be the *worse* for the suppression of these treasonable developments of any system of religious opinions? How they might be the *better* for it, may be easily imagined. The government would, then, be able to apply itself, with undisturbed free agency, to the redress of substantial grievances,—to the mitigation of national and traditional prejudices,—to the introduction of pacific and industrious habits,—and to the gradual improvement of the social fabric. But this process of amelioration is, under existing circumstances, scarcely practicable in Ireland. The people are free, as they ought to be, to listen to their priests. And their priests are free, as they ought *not* to be, to preach sedition to the people. And, all this while, the position of the priests is such as lays them under almost overpowering temptations to preach sedition, and to perpetuate and inflame the insurrectionary propensities of their flocks. And the result is, that any limited government must be crippled in its attempts to promote the general happiness and

peace. And therefore it is that we have said that the people of Ireland are, virtually, excluded from the *benefits* of the British constitution. That which is a blessing to us, seems to be little better than a curse to them. Those very institutions which have conferred grandeur and liberty on us, threaten to keep them down, for ever, in poverty and degradation.

In the mean time, in spite of the gathering shadows, the hopes of many, among the professed friends of Ireland, are gloriously bright. Wonders are to be accomplished by a course of liberal and conciliating policy, and, above all, of even-handed justice. And, doubtless, conciliation and justice are both most eminently commendable. But the worst of it is, that, with the Romanists of Ireland, conciliation *always* means unlimited concession; and that justice means any thing that Daniel O'Connell may be pleased to take into his head. O, but the general education of the people will, eventually, dissipate every delusion, and subdue every prejudice! But how is education to break the power of the priesthood, where the priests themselves are, in effect, the school-masters? But, then, infinite good may reasonably be expected from the introduction of a judicious system of poor laws. Let the good, however, be what it may, there is but little chance of its impairing the predominance of the Romish clergy; who will, probably, contrive to become the almoners of the legislative bounty. In short, it really would appear that Popery is now, to Ireland, what the Old Man of the Mountain was to Sinbad. It is difficult to imagine by what merely human effort it is ever to be shaken off. And, so long as it shall keep its seat, so long there *must* be, not only an antagonism of creeds, but a political strife for mastery; and this, too, with no imaginable end, but the total prostration and demolition of the weaker interest. The right hand of Popery must, indeed, have forgotten its cunning, if it can remain satisfied with retaining the crozier alone in its quiet and unambitious grasp. And the ministers of Popery would be more or less than men, if they could, uniformly and constantly, maintain the demeanour of spiritual serenity and peace, while the roar of stormy passion is every where around them, demanding their help, and craving their blessing upon the banners of revolt; and while there is no secular power able or willing to hinder their obedience to that call.

There are, indeed, few things more astonishing to us than the comfortable stagnation into which the public mind of England has settled down, upon the lees of its own ignorance, touching the peculiar genius of the Church of Rome. We are not now speaking of the *merely* theological errors and corruptions which disfigure her scheme of faith. Against these the outcry is, in

various quarters, sufficiently audible and vehement. The peculiarity, to which we allude, is her portentous elasticity; the property which enables her to shrink under pressure without being crushed; and to expand—to all appearance with augmented power of recoil—the instant the pressure is removed; which keeps her in perpetual readiness to diffuse herself in every direction; to rush out through the smallest opening; or to go forward, with a full tide of energy, where an entrance is ministered abundantly to her operations. Now there are many, who have never read history at all, and who, therefore, know nothing of this peculiarity; and there are others, who have read history in vain, and, therefore, care for none of these things. And these are the people who talk, with prodigious fluency and complacency, of the marvels to be wrought on the temper of the Romish Church by measures of equity, and of kindness, and of frank and generous confidence. They speak as if they were in possession of some very simple process, by which this active and “thought-executing” element could be reduced, as it were, to the condition of a non-elastic fluid, content with its appropriate measure of cubic inches. And, if any one should attempt to satisfy these persons that the satellites of the Church of Rome, and more especially the order of Jesuits, are, at this moment, deeply and incessantly engaged in a design for the recovery of her supremacy in this empire, he would probably be listened to with a stare of as much compassion, or contempt, as if he had given utterance to a grave prediction of the speedy restoration of the Druidical hierarchy. And yet—whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear—it is most certain that copious materials have been actually collected, relative to the condition of Romanism in this realm of Great Britain, for many years past; the details of which might furnish matter for serious meditation to all, whose trust in the progress and the efficacy of *Useful and Entertaining Knowledge* is not absolutely unlimited. The march of mind, we know, is astonishingly rapid. But yet it might be well, if the swift and the strong would remember the voice of proverbial wisdom; and learn that the race and the battle may, after all, be to an antagonist whom they despise. And this brings us to the Sermon of Archdeacon Broughton, “On the present Position and Duties of the Church of England.”

This Discourse is the production of a man eminently distinguished for sobriety of mind, as well as for steadiness of principle. And, yet, he scruples not to affirm, that “there are many and certain evidences to show a gigantic design has been conceived, “and is in a course of extensive execution, for re-establishing “here those tenets, and that dominion, which were overthrown at

“the Reformation,” p. 5. And, in support of this averment, he has subjoined to his Sermon a most important and interesting Appendix, embodying, in a brief narrative, much of the substance of those materials to which we have just adverted, and to which we ourselves have likewise had access. As these pages may, by possibility, meet the eye of some, who have hitherto wrapped themselves up in a superb disdain for the devices of Jesuits and Monks, we shall venture to call the public attention to some few prominent particulars from the collections in question.

It may scarcely, perhaps, be remembered, at the present day, that, in 1793, a small remnant of persons, under the vows of Loyola, were among the exiles who were then driven, by the fury of the French Revolution, to seek an asylum in this country. In 1795, these persons were described, in the Laity's Directory, as “the gentlemen of the Academy of Liege;” and as already settled “at Stonyhurst, near Clithero.” This country was, at that time, in the commencement of her long and agonizing conflict for the deliverance of Europe. Her struggle, for the next twenty years, was with the Demon of Jacobinism. With the Powers of the Vatican she had little cause of quarrel. And, accordingly, the “gentlemen of Liege” excited no more suspicion, than if they had been a small brotherhood of crazy astrologers or alchymists. And thus the Order of Jesus, which had been driven from the land in 1604, crept back again, under a lowly disguise, in 1795.

A period of general confusion and warfare was originally favourable to the quiet perseverance of these “*few ancient men*,” as they were termed by their apologist, Mr. Dallas. They had obtained the house and estate of Stonyhurst, under a long and advantageous lease, from the owner, Mr. Weld, a gentleman of an ancient and wealthy Roman Catholic family. The mansion was spacious, and excellently adapted to the purposes of a school or seminary. And what could be more reasonable and praiseworthy, in these aged exiles, than to provide for their own maintenance, by “the education of young gentlemen?” Accordingly, in 1797, came forth the Prospectus of “Stonyhurst College,” describing it as prepared for the convenient reception of 150 pupils, and offering to the public the attraction of singularly moderate terms.

It is well known that the training of youth has ever been, as it were, the fulcrum of that lever, by which the Jesuits have essayed to move the world. It now appeared that this philosophy had never been forgotten in the darkest days of their adversity. And, that their mechanism might be more powerful, a certain number of eleemosynary children were taken into the establishment, with a view to their eventual admission into holy orders. This part of the plan, (which was *not* publicly announced in the prospectus,)

was, of course, admirably fitted to provide the governing body with a succession of obedient, devoted, and serviceable agents.

The discipline established at Stonyhurst was in strict accordance with the spirit of the Romish Church, and after the most approved principles of the School of Loyola. It was, inflexibly and constantly, directed to one object—the subjugation of the individual will. The pupil can never, for one moment, escape the inspection of the “Prefect.” Whether in the intervals of recreation, or in the hours of study, he is pursued by the same Gorgon look, which, in time, turns the young heart almost to stone. The very walls of the institution seem to have eyes and ears. Even the mode of administering punishment is so contrived, as to exercise a sort of oppressive and mysterious influence on the spirit of the offender; for, the Superior simply announces to him the penalty he is to undergo; and, thereupon, the delinquent is expected to present himself to the Prefect, and respectfully to solicit the appointed number of stripes. In order that this awful discipline of submission might receive the least possible interruption from the influence of the domestic charities and social affections, the only absence allowed from scholastic controul was an annual vacation of one month: and even this was a concession extorted with difficulty from the austere genius of the place. For it was distinctly declared, that, “if the Directors could absolutely enforce their own serious and earnest desire,” the children should never be “called home during the course of their education.” And, lastly, when, by this sort of dark and subterranean process, the school-boy has been well nigh petrified into a student, he is transferred to the custody of the Professors; where the chains of priestly domination are riveted upon his conscience by the terrors of the Confessional: for, no less than once in every fortnight must he disclose his sins, and seek for absolution.

The institution, nevertheless, took root with astonishing rapidity and firmness. Nearly from the first, there was a large influx of pupils from Great Britain, from Ireland, and from various parts of the continent. The enterprising spirit of the fathers was naturally animated by success. Their scale of operations was enlarged. Their estate was rendered more valuable by a costly series of improvements. Their mansion was put into a condition of complete repair. A large and handsome wing was added to the original fabric. In the course of time, the number of students was doubled. The work of proselytism was vigorously and successfully prosecuted in the neighbourhood of Stonyhurst: and emissaries were constantly issuing from the establishment, to advance the sacred cause in other parts of the kingdom.

In 1814 a mighty impulse was given to their hopes, and to their movements, by an event which, at any other period, must

have occasioned an almost convulsive sensation in Christendom. In the month of August, in that year, the Order of Jesus was restored by a bull of Pope Pius VII. It must, here, be remembered, that in the course of little more than two centuries—from 1555 to 1773—this Society had been stigmatized by no less than thirty-seven expulsions from various states. And it is most remarkable, that, during the eighteenth century, most of the European countries, from which they had been driven, were precisely those who were the blindest in their devotion to the Romish faith. They were ejected from Savoy, in 1729; from Portugal, in 1759; from Spain and the two Sicilies, in 1767; from Parma, in 1768; from Malta, also, in 1768. But the last blow was the most astounding of all. In 1773 they were suppressed, not only at Rome, but throughout all Christendom, by a bull of Pope Ganganelli, Clement XIV. Four years did he painfully deliberate before he launched the thunder. But, at last, it fell. The Society was pronounced by him to be inherently mischievous and wicked, dangerous to the peace of the world, and unworthy of longer toleration. It might have been imagined, that, from thenceforth, the whole body would be regarded for ever as a *triste bidental*—a monument of divine vengeance—a vessel of wrath, broken to pieces like the work of the potter. No such thing. Forty years afterwards, the world beheld, with astonishment, another bull, reinstating this same Society in all its plenitude; and this, too, without the slightest notice of the grounds of their condemnation; without denial, or refutation, of the charges which had been so fatally urged against them; without expressing disapprobation of the doctrines and the practices which had been imputed to them; without a word of prohibition, or of caution, against the revival of such practices and doctrines. His solicitude for the security of the Church is the only motive which Pius VII. is pleased to allege in vindication of this seemingly hazardous and desperate edict. He found the bark of St. Peter tossed with continual storms; and, therefore, he deemed that he should be guilty of a great crime towards God, if he should neglect to employ “these vigorous and experienced rowers,” who made a voluntary tender of their services. His audacity was well justified by the event. The “vigorous rowers” started up, and seized the oars, with an alacrity, which showed that their vitality had never, for a moment, been suspended.

————— κάρυξε δ' αὐτοῖς
 ἐμβαλεῖν κώπαισι ΤΕΡΑΣΚΟΠΙΟΣ, ἀ-
 -δείας ἐνίπτων ἐλπίδας.
 εἰρεσία δ' ὑπεχώ-
 -ρησεν ταχειᾶν ἐκ παλαμᾶν ἄκορος.

Among these "vigorous rowers" were the men of Stonyhurst. And there occurred, about this same period, some circumstances, which gave peculiar value to their exertions. By this time, the "gentlemen of Liege," or their associates and successors, were the Superiors of an imposing establishment, the lords of a large territorial domain, and the central power of a still wider circle of predominant influence. In the meanwhile, the munificent national endowment of Maynooth College, had been elating the hearts, and raising the hopes and aspirations, of the Romanists in Ireland. It appears, however, that there was one serious drawback upon the satisfaction excited by the prosperity of that institution. Its theology laboured under certain suspicions of unsoundness. In the first place, it was observed, with deep regret, that the principles of the Gallican Church had been too much countenanced by the conductors of that establishment; and, secondly, that alarming symptoms had been manifested in its lecture-rooms, of a tendency towards the errors of Jansenism. One instance of this, was a declaration, made by Dr. Ferris, one of the professors, to the effect, that "the merits of the saints, when compared with the merits of Christ, were no more than a drop of water when compared with the ocean." These were sounds of doctrine hardly to be endured by the Romish Hierarchy of Ireland; who were understood to have acquiesced in all the edicts from the Vatican, by which the Papal Supremacy was most extravagantly exalted; and, moreover, to have accepted the celebrated bull *Unigenitus*, which condemned the propositions of Quesnel, and solemnly approved the moral teaching of the Jesuits. In this exigency, the attention of the faithful was turned towards Stonyhurst, whose orthodoxy was always without spot or wrinkle: and, among her disciples, they found a man admirably fitted for the work of reformation—the Rev. Peter Kenney. This gentleman had received his early education at this establishment; and, during his residence in England, had taken the simple vows of the Order of Jesus. And, after that Order had been revived in Sicily, by a Special Brief from Rome, in 1804, he proceeded to Palermo for the express purpose of being formally and solemnly incorporated into the Society. This individual was the person selected to purify the theology of Maynooth. He was, accordingly, appointed to the office of vice-president, the president being Dr. Murray, the present titular Archbishop of Dublin. He was, there, especially entrusted with the charge of conducting the periodical exercises, known by the name of *Retreats*; a word implying certain seasons set apart for the purposes of religious meditation and discussion. This office, from its very nature, gave him an almost unlimited command over the minds of the young men; and the

result was, that the genius of Loyola speedily became predominant at Maynooth.

But there was still further occasion for the inestimable services of Mr. Kenney. The college of Maynooth was endowed by our government expressly and *solely* for the education of the priesthood: whereas it is well known that the Order of Jesus has, evermore, grasped at the education of all mankind. This principle of monopoly was soon found to be in full activity at Maynooth: for, a design was actually formed for the establishment of a supplementary seminary for the education of laymen; and this, too, within the very walls of the clerical institution! The project was defeated by the vigilance and firmness of Mr. Abbot, afterwards Lord Colchester. But the spirit of the Order was not to be baffled. In 1813 the estate of Clongowes Wood, only six miles from Maynooth, was purchased, with a view to its conversion into a lay college. In *July*, 1814, the building was opened for the reception of scholars, and Mr. Kenney was appointed to fill the office of president. In *August*, 1814, (with memorable coincidence,) the Bull was issued for the restoration of the Order of Jesus; and the validity of its vows were established throughout the world. The "vigorous and experienced rowers" were, thus, encouraged to throw themselves lustily upon their oars. The terrors of the navigation vanished before them. They were no longer appalled with difficulties and dangers, threatening, from opposite quarters, to crush them with destructive collision. And their way towards the possession of the precious mystic fleece was, thenceforth, left, comparatively, without serious impediment.

The affiliation of the younger institution with the parent seminary of "the gentlemen of Liege" being rendered complete, Mr. Kenney was joined by others of his order, who became his colleagues in the task of education. The intercourse between Clongowes and Stonyhurst has, since that time, been intimate, and without interruption: and, between them, the work of restoring and extending the dominion of the Romish Church has been carried on with incomparable harmony, and untiring perseverance. Some indications of their success appear upon the face of the parliamentary evidence. Mr. Kenney there states, upon oath, that, when he became Vice-President of Maynooth, there were but two members of the Jesuit Order beside himself in the whole of Ireland. And from a return, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed in 1880, the number of persons in Ireland bound by the Jesuit vows, appears to be fifty-eight, and in England one hundred and seventeen. What augmentation may have taken place in the interval we are unable to say. But, still,

it must be allowed, we imagine, that the phenomena distinctly before us are sufficiently remarkable to demand some attention. "A few ancient men"—a small company of destitute and persecuted exiles—appear as the founders of a towering and prosperous institution, with ample funds at its command,—devoted, with all its powers and resources, to the cause of the Romish Church,—and directed by members of the most subtle, ambitious, and indefatigable fraternity, that was ever organized by the ingenuity of man.

It was not to be supposed that the Pilot of St. Peter's bark would look, without deep interest, upon these accessions to his crew; and, in order that their exertions might want no encouragement which he could bestow, his most affectionate regards were, at length, emphatically manifested towards a kindred fraternity, which was capable of becoming an eminently valuable auxiliary to their labours—namely, the *English College* at Rome. Accordingly, in October, 1827, his Holiness, *for the first time during several centuries*, was graciously pleased to visit this Society, at their summer retreat, about fourteen miles from the Eternal City. Of this memorable excursion, a very striking account is now extant, written by one who was formerly a pupil of Stonyhurst, and who was himself present on the occasion. Nothing can be more animated than the picture he has given us of the solemnity in question. The affability and condescension of his Holiness were unspeakably gratifying and impressive. He allowed the brethren to kiss his hand and his foot. He blessed their beads. He dined at their table. He conferred on them, as they knelt before him, the animating and pregnantly eloquent appellation of "*the hope of the Church*." After his departure, he sent them, as a present, a beautiful young calf, decorated with flowers; and, to crown all, he issued directions to his Master of the Ceremonies, to the effect that, in the procession of *Corpus Christi*, he should assign to the students of the *English College*, the honour of holding the Baldacchino, or Canopy, which is borne over the person of the Pontiff, as he carries the holy Sacrament abroad.

It is scarcely possible, one would imagine, to mistake these indications. But, in all directions, there are other keen and well-feathered shafts upon the wing; the sound whereof may be inaudible to the many, but which are whistling, clearly and sharply, in the ears of the intelligent! There is, positively, a "sleet of arrowy shower" abroad. Among these, we may reckon a prodigal application of the resources of the Society *de Propagandâ*, &c., to the purposes of the *English Mission*. And then, within the limits of this mission, there are Christian Doctrine

Societies; and there are *Purgatorian Societies*, with circulating libraries attached;* and there are Stations of the Cross for Pilgrimages; and there are Dispensations, and Scapulars, and Religious Sale Libraries. And, lastly, there are various Devotional Sodalities or Confraternities: for instance, the Confraternity of the Secular Priests of St. Paul; the Sodality of the Heart of Mary; and, above all, there is the *Sodality of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*. And,—(to use the language of a most intelligent friend, who has very recently surveyed this multifarious agency in Ireland,)—these contrivances are all interwoven into the Romish system. They belong to it,—they strengthen it,—they extend it,—and, so far as human means can do so, they *universalize* it. To these circumstances it must be added, that, encouraged by the example of the Jesuits, the other regular orders have vigorously resumed their operations; that six colleges, besides Stonyhurst, under the direction of one or other of these orders, are now in activity, on a very extended scale, in various parts of this kingdom; that, according to the Laity's Directory for the present year, the number of Roman Catholic chapels in England and Wales is 410; that every newspaper announces a constant accession to that number; and that no chapel is erected without producing a large influx of proselytes.

One word, before we proceed, on the last-mentioned of the *Confraternities* above adverted to,—the Sodality of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. This Sodality was introduced into Maynooth College in 1822; and is described by Mr. Kenney, before the Commission of Irish Education, in 1826, as “a pious association of individuals, Roman Catholics, priests, bishops, laymen, and women,—any one whatsoever,—having for its object to honour the Sacred Humanity of Christ, under the symbol of his Sacred Heart; as the heart is the emblem of the virtues of human nature.” But he, and the other members of the establishment, positively denied that this Sodality has ever been under the direction of the Jesuits, or that it implies the exercise of any influence by that Society over the scheme of education adopted at Maynooth. It would be impossible for us to detail the history of this species of devotion. But if any one is desirous of ascertaining whether or not it is an institute in the highest estimation with the Order of Jesus, he may satisfy himself by consulting the Life of Scipio Ricci,† Bishop of Pistoia; and, further, by looking into that part of the Eighth Report of the Commission of 1826,

* The Book of Rules for all these societies, and observances, was published in 1832, by Warren, 8, High Street, Dublin, “with approbation of superiors.”

† Vie de Scipion de Ricci, Evêque de Pistoie et Prato, &c. &c. Par de Potter, Auteur de l'Esprit de l'Eglise, chap. xiv. tom. i. p. 58, &c. Bruxelles. 1825.

which relates to the system of Maynooth College. We have, before us, several of the offices and exercises in use among the votaries of *Cardiolatry*. Without entering into any discussion of their theological merits or demerits, it may be sufficient to say, that they are such as no sound religious taste could possibly endure. They rankly savour of what may be called a vile sort of Romish Methodism; and this, very frequently, of the most sickening cast. And yet, we can easily imagine, that they might operate, like a luscious dram, upon temperaments weakened and vitiated by the habitual excitements of superstition; and, if so, it would scarcely appear wonderful, if such preparations should be found to have issued copiously from the Laboratory of Jesuitism. A specimen or two may suffice :

HYMN.

- “ O heart, Love’s victim, slain !
 O Heaven’s lasting joy !
 To whom distressed mortals fly,
 Nor fly for help in vain :
- “ Darling of the Trinity
 The Holy Ghost is eased,
 In Thee ; th’ Almighty is well pleased ;
 His Son has wedded Thee.
- “ The Father’s only One,
 Chaste Spouse of Lovers pure,
 Who canst no rival love endure,
 Possess our hearts alone. Amen.”

ANTHEM.

“ O Sacred Heart of Jesus, the most perfect pattern of purity ! make us clean of heart, that we may merit according to thy heart.”

Vers. O God of my heart, my heart is ready to do thy will.

Resp. My God ! I desire it ; and to carry my heart in the midst of thy heart.”

&c. &c. &c.!!

Our space forbids us to venture upon a larger exposition of the evidence, which has satisfied us, more potently than ever, that Romanism has in it a power and energy which (humanly speaking) is irrepressible; that it resembles a vegetable seed, which may be buried in a mummy-case for three or four thousand years, and yet, if dropped into the ground, would, incontinently, spring up in vigorous development;—that, what was said of the royal strumpet of Egypt, may almost be said of the Church of Rome,—

“ Age cannot wither her, not custom stale
 Her infinite variety.”

Mutable, most undoubtedly, she may be, in her occasional accommodation of herself to "the form and pressure of the age." But nothing, we apprehend, can be more *immutable* than her sleepless ambition, her desire to stamp an image of herself wherever she may find materials at all capable of the impression. We may apply to her the language used by Paley, when speaking of the spine of vertebrated animals, and say, that she has much of "the strength of the oak, and the *sinuosity* of the osier." And, in saying all this, we should perhaps be saying little that would not be to her honour, if her cause were as good, as her main *principles* of action are steady and unchangeable. It might be well for us of the Reformed faith, if, in imitation of her wisdom, there were more converging of our affections to a single point, and more diverging of our activities from that same point, than has ever yet been witnessed since the days of the Reformation. But, be this as it may, we hold it to be unspeakably important that the true genius of Romanism should be distinctly understood; and that we should not be putting an implicit trust in the virtue which is to go forth from merely human knowledge, when we have to do with an adversary who is consummately accomplished in the art of allying herself either with knowledge or with ignorance, as she may find occasion; and of moulding each of them to her necessities and her designs. We are conscious, indeed, that there may appear something preposterously strange, and even ludicrous, in all this urgency of warning, gravely delivered in the nineteenth century, against the influences which are constantly going forth from the Seven Hills. But three centuries have now gone by since this land shook herself from the thralldom of Her that is seated thereon. And, during that period, such changes have come upon the face of society,—such mighty and visible counter-agencies have been at work,—that the ancient predominance of Rome, and her cruel lust for supremacy and power, have well-nigh passed into the regions of fable. At this day, most men think but little more of the faggots of Smithfield, than they do of the gigantic images of wicker-work, into which human holocausts were crowded by the savage priesthood of our painted forefathers. And hence it is that they muffle themselves up in the persuasion that the spirit which dictated these experiments upon mortal credulity and patience is departed from the earth, never to return. Now we, too, are comparatively but little haunted by the "fierce vexation" of those dreams which may agitate the more nervous and hectic students of martyrology. But yet, we are by no means satisfied that there exist at Rome a wax-work Pope, and wax-work Cardinals, and nothing more! On the contrary, our conviction is, that the principle of life is still

active and stirring in the Vatican. And every one must know that, in Ireland at least, the genius of Rome survives in the plenitude of its original energy; and that, at this moment, it is scattering dragon's teeth over the soil, which may speedily spring up into a harvest of anarchy and blood. And, if this be so, a heavy spirit of slumber must have fallen upon us, if we can behold the signs of the coming strife, and yet, "keep the natural ruby on our cheeks."

That the hopes of the Roman Catholics, throughout the empire, are lofty, and their exultation rampant, is beyond all controversy. Are not their own words, even now, sounding in our ears? Their cry is—"Our enemies see the rapid progress which "our divine religion is making *throughout these islands*; and the "churches, chapels, colleges, convents and schools, rising up in "such numbers and magnificence, make them quake for fear. "And well they may fear! for the arm of the Lord is with us, "and we defy them, in the name of God, to resist us. Heresy, "already grown old, and tottering on its last stage, will soon be "no more; and these kingdoms will again become faithful portions of the Church. Whether we shall live to see this happy, "this blessed day, we cannot certainly say; but happy and glorious will he be who contributes to accelerate its arrival." In a similar tone, a Roman Catholic priest, very lately, addressed a gentleman, well known to us, with whom he was conversing on the efforts made to storm the works of Popery by violence of *preaching*. With a smile of triumph, he observed, "*Priests* "laugh at *preachers*, but they dread *the Church*. They know "that, in her weakness, lies their strength; *and they love to see* "sectarians *tear her to pieces from within*. It spares them the "trouble of assailing her from without. To *our Church* you "must look for preservation from heresy and schism. *Ours* is "the only system which *must* ultimately prevail. *I look forward* "to the re-establishment of our system, not in Ireland only, but in "England as well. We shall go over and convert you all there, "before long. Your Protestant friends have had their day. "Ours is now advancing." And he added—"Your clergy dare "not imitate the spirit of unity, which is our great bond of "strength. They know that if they did, they would merge into "our Church. And, therefore, in order to diverge more widely "from her, they say but little of their own."

And are not these words of our adversary pregnant with awful instruction? Is it not appalling to see that Popish Churchmen rise in their own estimation, just in proportion as they perceive our Churchmen falling to the level of Dissenters? Preserved by primitive discipline, our Church might, by the grace of God, bid

defiance to the Infidel, the Romanist, the Dissenter, and the World. But, alas! because the Romanist exalts the authority of his Church to the stars, we, truly, must make proof of our *uncorruptness* and simplicity, by debasing the authority of our Church to the very dust! And thus it is, that while she is acknowledged by us, in words, to be a divinely appointed guardian of truth, we are content that every section of the Protestant world should dispute that honour with her. And thus, too, it is, that while Popery throws a magic veil over her deformities, the ultra-Protestant spirit of the age despises and rejects the sanctities and beauties, which are the appropriate distinctions of the visible Church of Christ. We claim a right to the temples and the endowments which were wrested by our forefathers from Papal domination and rapacity. And, when the secular arm is stretched forth to touch them, we cry out sacrilege, spoliation, robbery! But, just and righteous as this outcry may be, it still is melancholy to find, that, all this while, the voice of our daily services is so often echoed by the bare walls of our glorious cathedrals! The sanctuary is dishonoured by that worst of desecrations, the desertion of the worshippers; and, hence, each man is strongly tempted to erect his own closet into a sort of anti-sanctuary; and to seek the face of God in the prayer-meeting, rather than amidst the assembled congregation; and to make a Pope of his own private judgment; or, at all events, to resort to the lips of the Boanerges of his neighbourhood: till the land is in danger of being parcelled out among a multitude of co-ordinate *Infallibilities!* And all this is just as our enemies would have it. Of course, they prefer to encounter a mob of sects, rather than the compact and massive columns of a *truly* Catholic establishment. And, if a low sectarian spirit should ever deeply and widely penetrate the body of the Church, the fibres of her strength must gradually be loosened from each other. And then will her knees be relaxed, and her hands wax faint; and they who seek her destruction will, at least for a season, be suffered to prevail against her.

This, then, is the lesson we are to learn from the untiring energy of those “posters of the sea and land,” the emissaries of Rome. We are to learn that a spirit of unity is not to be successfully encountered by a spirit of division; that the perversion and abuse of Church principles, by one party, can never justify the utter abandonment of Church principles by another party; that if Rome still has, in her, something dangerous, it is our wisdom to fear it,—to fear it, not with abject cowardice, or frantic terror; but with a fear which awakens to repentance for past neglect or error, and which animates to vigorous application, and unsparing self-devotion, for the future. Above all, we have to learn the folly and the mad-

ness of consigning the cause of the Reformed Verity to the protection of refined and highly cultivated Reason. To rely on the armoury of Knowledge alone, is to go down to Egypt for help, and to stay on horses, and to trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong. For, if we look not to the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord, mere human knowledge, after all, may prove as the staff of a broken reed, which pierces the hand of them that lean upon it. If Knowledge should be strong enough to beat down Popery, it may also be treacherous enough to build up nothing but a temple to her own glory upon the ruins. And, surely, it would be a mad and desperate game, if we were to offer our backs to the saddle, and our flanks to the spur, and our jaws to the bridle, of a godless, heartless, republican, and therefore tyrannical philosophy; and all, because we once were galled, past endurance, with the burdens laid upon us by Pontifical ambition! Let us, rather, courageously look *all* the various perils of our condition in the face. The Church of England is, once more, between the upper and the nether millstone. The Church of Rome is stretching out her head, with earnest expectation of her return to supremacy and dominion; and she is, at the same time, stretching out one hand to Jacobinism, and another hand to Dissent. And portentous is the harmony struck up, for the time, between the high contracting parties, intent upon the demolition of their common enemy. And, all this while, the semi-sadducéan wisdom of the day is looking on, with the sleepy eye of indifference, or scorn, to see the issue of this magnanimous and most righteous adventure,—but yet, with something of secret exultation at the thought, that the various forms of *superstition* are, *happily*, engaged in the destruction of each other. This, we earnestly believe, is a true and faithful exposition of the present state of things. But let it not, for one moment, be imagined that we say this in a temper of craven despondency, or of fiery exasperation. There is One who will have in derision all them that take counsel against the Church, if her sons be found faithful to Him and to themselves. Let them be but true to their privileges and their duties; and then, the pressure and the crush of the upper and the nether millstone, shall be, as if the potsherd were striking against the everlasting rock.

ART. II.—*Natural Theology considered with reference to Lord Brougham's Discourse on that Subject.* By Thomas Turton, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Dean of Peterborough. London. Parker. 1836. 8vo. pp. 354.

It may be recollected by some of our readers, that in our review of Lord Brougham's Preliminary Discourse to Paley's Natural Theology—while we accorded to the noble author the meed of much sound and enlarged philosophy, clothed in a high order of eloquence peculiarly his own—we could not but express our surprise at several extraordinary omissions in his arguments, and much seeming injustice to other writers on the subject. The *first* ground of our complaint referred to the Ethical Department of his Discourse, and his total oversight of the existence of conscience as the basis of our moral constitution. The *second* arose from his untruly arrogating to himself the discovery of the Divine wisdom displayed in our mental structure as a truth in natural theology—thus betraying either an unjustifiable ignorance or suppression of the merits of his predecessors.

In almost any other writer than his lordship we should have visited these grave faults with severity. Some of our contemporary journals have not allowed his right to be an exception. But we felt so gratified that a mind—of whom we had thought such hard things—should come forward with so noble an avowal of attachment both to natural and revealed religion, that we welcomed the incipient buddings, though unhealthy ones, as at least indicative of moral life, and presumptions that a returning spring might be more full of promise. Moreover, common justice demanded peculiar gentleness to such extra-official yet praiseworthy pursuits. Totally forgetting for the time our well-known views of his lordship's public efforts, we felt that the exactitude, and deliberation, and complete logic of the peaceful cloister, could not be expected from the fatigued, feverish chamber of the politician. And if ever we had been driven to look indignantly at some features of his life, we loved to recognize one in which our common sympathies could unite. His lordship's sternest foes might at least regard it with affection, as an "oasis" in what they deem a desert.

We are truly glad to find that the amiable and learned Dr. Turton felt the same. Nothing can be more refreshing than to turn from some rabid persecutions of his lordship's performance, to this mild, this dispassionate, this truth-loving little volume. It will be seen hereafter, that on some points we are as much at

issue with Dr. Turton as we are on other points with Lord Brougham, but we cannot forbear, at the outset, from thus cordially expressing our approbation. Any reader of his volume—without personal knowledge of the doctor—will draw the true inference of his unaffected learning and amiableness. His literary fault—“a leaning to virtue’s side”—is exceeding distrust of the conclusions of his own judgment, arising from a kindly estimate both of the power and honesty of those of others.

It is very evident that Dr. Turton was induced to write this work more from a pious wish to vindicate the fame of some of his favourite authors, than to enter the lists of discussion with Lord Brougham. It is true, that in some parts of the volume, he becomes his lordship’s antagonist on the abstract merits of a doctrine: this, however, is but seldom. Most generally he is canvassing the noble lord’s strictures upon Paley’s classifications and omissions, or Clarke’s argument *à priori*, or Warburton’s paradox. This is a natural and pleasing task. Our affection to our favourite authors is not a cold, passionless approval of their beauties and their truths. We insensibly regard them as living impersonations. We feel towards them as our living friends. We become jealous of their honour: if we hear one of them admired, we look towards the admirer with something more than the response of intellectual assent,—he has with us a *common* friend,—there is a bond of sympathy: or if, on the contrary, we hear one of them impugned, the impugner is not regarded merely as a dissident, he becomes a foe. Now it seems that Dr. Turton has acted under this impression in his answer to Lord Brougham: and he comes forward to vindicate *his* favourites from misrepresentation and oversight. We hardly think that this was necessary: nevertheless, we will not quarrel with Dr. Turton, and since he has, meanwhile, been induced to throw out some valuable correlative sentiments, we give his work our best recommendation.

Happily, our author is not guilty himself of the first fault with which he charges Lord Brougham. One of the great literary sins of the day is the attempt to introduce an aristocracy in style. While some writers are striving to simplify every thing naturally abstruse and scientific, by the adoption of terms and a phraseology the most vernacular,—others, as if they contained within them the elements of repulsion, have started off to the opposite extreme. Philosophers must have no truth exhibited to them in plainness; there *must* be—not only when it is unavoidable but perforce—scientific *language* as well as scientific statement. It is no longer enough that a term is perspicuous, and pure; and elegant, it must be literary—remote from common life—esoteric. Even our moral treatises, our very sermons, have become thus

defiled. We quarrel not with that peculiarity of phrase, which—richer and more euphonous than social diction—a constant intercourse with books will make natural. But we abhor from our very souls the forced profundity, and magniloquence which are become so popular. Soon, very soon, Addison and Bolingbroke will be forgotten as too simple, too *unliterary*, for the age—perspicuity will become darkness, and sublimity be seated in the clouds. On this point our author perfectly coincides with us. In his preface he charged Lord Brougham's Discourse with *obscurity*, and in accounting for it he adduces the following admirable observations:—

“ It has long been deemed the glory of Socrates, that he brought philosophy from the schools of the learned to the habitations of men—by stripping it of its technicalities, and exhibiting it in the ordinary language of life. There is no one, in modern times, who has possessed this talent to an equal extent with Paley; and we can scarcely conceive any one to have employed it with greater success. The transmutation of metals into gold was the supreme object of the alchymist's aspirations. But Paley had acquired a more enviable power. Knowledge, however abstruse, by passing through his mind, became plain common sense—stamped with the characters which ensured its currency in the world. At present, the tendency is in the opposite direction. The disposition is to dignify almost every thing with the semblance of science. Matters which have long been understood, sufficiently for all practical purposes, are worked up into a system; and the most pliant of ancient languages is ransacked for combinations of syllables, to be employed in the service of the new scheme of classification. To correspond with all this, the infant science is taught to speak in phrases of large import, and to use expressions familiar only to the mathematical philosophers. Now, it is undoubtedly *possible* to give, to many departments of knowledge, the formalities here described; and so, by their aspect at least, to recommend them to men of science; and this appears to have been Lord Brougham's intention with respect to Natural Theology; for he informs us that ‘ the composition of his Discourse was undertaken in consequence of an observation which he had often made, that scientific men were apt to regard the study of Natural Religion as little connected with philosophical pursuits.’ The intention, indeed, is manifest throughout the Discourse; and if I do not mistake, the *obscurity* which has been felt to pervade the work, arises from his Lordship's *manner* of communicating to Natural Theology a more scientific character than, in his opinion, had been previously assigned to it. . . . Beyond doubt, the truth of science may exist with little or nothing of the form; and in that state the great object of inquiry is, after all, the most accessible to inquirers of every order. Such being the case, whoever ventures to invest any portion of human knowledge with a more scientific exterior, ought to take especial care that it do not, from want of clearness or consistency, appear, to those for whom the change is designed, to have the form of science, with little or nothing of the truth.”—p. 4—6.

We have said that Dr. Turton is happily exempt from this fault. No *double* meaning—no half meaning, can be assigned to any of his sentences. We should not say that this perspicuity depended so much upon his command of language as on his perspicuity and honesty of mind.

But to pass from the style to the contents of this volume. Its most valuable as well as most original discussions are contained in the last two sections. In some of the notes to his Preliminary Discourse, Lord Brougham had contended that the ancient philosophers held as truths in natural religion the doctrines of “the Immortality of the Soul,” and “Future Rewards and Punishments.” His lordship, in the body of his work, had argued that these doctrines could be deduced from observations of natural phenomena: and therefore thought it advisable to adduce as a strong confirmatory illustration, that without the aid of revelation, they *had* actually been deduced. And this theory was in such open defiance of the arguments of the celebrated Bishop Warburton, in his “Divine Legation,”—that it was further thought advisable to discuss *them*.

From several expressions in his volume we are inclined to think that Dr. Turton looks very leniently upon the bishop’s hypothesis; and as it is certain that this opinion, coming from so influential an individual as the Divinity Professor of one of our Universities will have great weight, we deem it incumbent on us, somewhat fully, to examine into its value. We are quite aware that the stigma of paradox with which the “Divine Legation” was branded, instantly upon its publication, drew upon it “unmerited neglect,”—and that its writer’s unconciliatory tone rather armed against than convinced his readers. Nevertheless, abating all this, we are not disposed to think that a more welcome reception would, in the end, have confirmed its positions. We perfectly agree with Lord Brougham: “The merit of the Divine Legation lies in its learning and in its collateral argument; indeed, nearly the whole is collateral and unconnected with the purpose of his reasoning. But much, even of that collateral matter, is fanciful and unsound. If any one has lent his ear to the theory that the ancients had no belief in a future state of retribution, it can only be from being led away by confident assertion from the examination of facts.” Lord Brougham has not entered into any formal proof of these accusations;—neither has Dr. Turton, though he disallows them, undertaken their refutation. We shall therefore endeavour, very briefly, both to revive the work itself to the notice of our readers, and submit our reasons for our opinion respecting it. And if we could but induce the Cambridge Professor to enter on Warburton’s vindic-

cation, we should hail it as a sure and good accession to our theological literature.

In Bishop Warburton's time it was a popular sceptical objection that the Mosaic economy was seriously defective as a religious system, inasmuch as it revealed nothing of a future state of retribution. The Bishop undertook its refutation, not with the direct reply and proof that the allegation was untrue, but seriously admitting the fact, he denied the inference. The far-fetched nature of his argument would alone be a presumption against its conclusiveness. To avoid the possibility of misrepresentation, we will quote his own outlines:

"In this demonstration, then, which we may suppose very little short of mathematical certainty, and to which nothing but a mere physical possibility of the contrary case can be opposed, we demand only this single *postulatum* that hath all the clearness of self evidence, namely,

"That a skilful lawgiver, establishing a religion and civil policy, acts with certain views and for certain ends; and not capriciously, or without purpose or design.

"This being granted, we erect our demonstration on these three very clear and simple propositions:—

"I. That the inculcating the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, is necessary to the well being of civil society.

"II. That all mankind, especially the most wise and learned nations of antiquity, have concurred in believing and teaching that this doctrine was of such use to civil society.

"III. That the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of the Mosaic dispensation.

"Propositions so clear and evident, that one would think, we might directly proceed to our conclusion.

"That therefore the law of Moses is of divine original. Which one or both of the two following syllogisms will evince.

"I. Whatsoever religion and society have no future state for their support, must be supported by an extraordinary providence.

"The Jewish religion and society had no future state for their support.

"Therefore, the Jewish religion and society were supported by an extraordinary providence.

"And again, II. The ancient lawgivers universally believed that such a religion could be supported only by an extraordinary providence.

"Moses, who instituted such a religion, was an ancient lawgiver.

"Therefore, Moses believed his religion was supported by an extraordinary providence."—*Warburton's Divine Legation*, vol. i. p. 7.

Now it is not our province in this article to enter upon the general argument of the "Divine Legation." Were it so, we should summarily reply that the whole of it was unsound, because it proceeds upon an untruth as to the silence of the Mosaic books upon a future state of retribution: we would simply refer

our readers to the fourth section of the third part of Dean Graves's invaluable work upon the Pentateuch; or—what in all honest interpretation would, we think, be sufficient to a believer in the new Testament—would quote our blessed Lord's own language: "and as touching the dead that *they rise*: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err." But we say the discussion of this point is not our province, save by showing the fundamental error of the bishop's work, to justify our dissent from Dr. Turton's approbation of it. Our object rather is to establish Lord Brougham's charge in the first place, that most of its reasonings are collateral; and secondly, that one of those collateral reasonings, namely, that the ancient philosophers did not believe in a state of future retribution, is inconclusive.

I. The whole of the second Book of the Legation is taken up with the proposition—that the ancient Philosophers, while they considered its popular belief essential to the existence of civil society, *regarded the doctrine of future rewards and punishments nothing but an advantageous fiction*. What relation *this* has to the argument, is, we confess, beyond our power to discover. It is an insulated treatise. Whether the doctrine is useful in producing subordination, or is not,—is surely independent on the degree of credence which a particular body of men thought fit to attach to it. And herein, therefore, we think Lord Brougham's critique perfectly substantiated.

II. But the second question is of more general moment. Is it true that as Bishop Warburton asserts, and as Dr. Turton likewise seems to think, it was only the common people among the ancients who gravely believed and looked forward to a future state wherein should be instituted a retributory correspondence with the present? It is admitted that such acute observers as the ancient philosophers, must have seen that all the *representations* of a future world, the fields of Elysium and the walls of Tartarus, and the flames of Phlegethon, the wheel of Ixion, the stone of Sisyphus, and the Promethean vulture, were creations of fancy. It is admitted that they regarded the sixth book of Virgil's *Æneid*, its Cumæan grot, its "*geminæ Somni portæ*," with just as much abstract deference as we regard the "*sabbione ardente*," and "*pioggia di fuoco*" of Dante, or the

" Fiery deluge, fed

With ever-burning sulphur unconsumed,"

of Milton. It is admitted that these poetic accidents of the doctrine had as much weight with thoughtful speculators, as the

mythological details of the wars, the quarrels, the wounds, the lamentations, the incestuousness of the gods.* But are we thence to infer that the unvarnished doctrine itself was similarly esteemed? Because of the scepticism, or rather decided disbelief, of Cicero in the pagan attributes ascribed to their divinities, are we to brand him with Atheism? and may we not ask, with equal justice, because the ancient Philosophers ridiculed the minute specifications of pleasure or torment in a future state which they thought fit to hold out to the unthinking multitude, did they abjure the theory of retribution altogether?

Let us hear Dr. Turton's opinion on this question: "To express my view of the matter in a few words. There is an apparent contradiction between the philosophy and the religion of those ancient times. It ought, then, to be shown, either that the apparent, is not a real contradiction; or that the sages in question fairly abandoned their philosophy and adhered to their religion. Something at least of this kind ought to be done, before any one can justly infer the 'firm and sound belief' of those old philosophers, in a future state."†

We think this is a fair alternative, and we certainly should choose the first; and for this reason—the relation which their philosophy bore to their religion is immaterial. Conduct and opinion may agree or disagree, there is no natural necessity of their correspondence. Now, the religion of these ancient philosophers was more a matter of conduct, of behaviour than of opinion, and their adherence to it, therefore, did not necessitate an abandonment of their philosophy. None can be more disposed than ourselves to insist that the inconstancy, the discrepancies between creed and action, were some of their foulest blemishes. We fully agree with Barrow, "there was few or none of the philosophers, who did not signify his dislike or contempt of the vulgar opinions and practices concerning religion; what Cicero saith of one part, the wiser sort did judge of all: '*Tota res est inventa fallaciis aut ad quæstum, aut ad superstitionem, aut ad errorem,*' (The whole business was deceitfully forged either for gain, or out of superstition, or from mistake.) They did indeed,

* "Exposui fere (inquit Cicero) non philosophorum judicia sed delirantium somnia: nec enim multo absurdiora sunt ea, quæ poetarum vocibus fusa, ipsâ suavitæ nocuerunt: qui et irâ inflammatos, et libidine furentes induxerunt deos: feceruntque, ut eorum bella, pugnas, prælia, vulnera videremus; odia præterea, dissidia, discordias, ortus, interitus, querelas, lamentationes, effusas in omni intemperantiâ libidines, adulteria, vincula, cum humano genere concubitus, mortalesque ex immortaliprocreatos. Cum poetarum autem errore conjungere licet portenta magorum, Ægyptiorumque in eodem genere dementiam; tum etiam vulgi opiniones, quæ in maximâ inconstantia, veritatis ignorance versantur."—*De Nat. Deor. lib. i. sect. 16*, Edit. Ernesti.

† Page 296.

most or all of them, in their external behaviour, comply with common practice, out of a politic discretion, for their safety and quiet sake: but in their inward thoughts and judgments, they (as by many passages in their writings doth appear) believed nothing, nor liked anything in it: they observed those things as Seneca said, ‘*tanquam legibus jussa, non tanquam diis grata*,’—(not as acceptable to the gods themselves, but as commanded by the laws of their country.)”* Nevertheless as we have already asked, do these instances of incredulity respecting those *modes* in which the religious doctrines of a divinity and a future state were put forth, prove that they were incredulous respecting those religious doctrines themselves *in the abstract*?

Now in answering this inquiry we think that too much value has been given to certain isolated passages extracted from the tomes of ancient Philosophy. This we think, though we agree with Dr. Turton that “it might be distinctly shown by a copious induction of particulars; namely, that in the schools of ancient Philosophy, an opinion very generally prevailed that the human soul was originally a portion severed from the divine substance, and therefore by nature immortal—and that it was destined—after a series of migrations from one body to another—according to Plato for moral purposes, as punishment, reward, and purification—to constitute, once more, a part of the divine substance—the individual existence being lost in the existence of the Deity.”† Thus, omitting the mistakes of their Psychology, the doctrine of retribution enters into the Metempsychosis of the ancients. But we say, too much value has been put upon the induction from particular passages. We think that if Dr. Turton had carried out his own admirable principles as to man’s *moral constitution*, he would have been so certain that the ancients *did* believe in retribution, and so convinced of the danger of a contrary hypothesis, as to have refused his sanction to the arguments of Warburton.

Speaking of Lord Brougham he says:—

“But the last omission which I shall notice—and by far the most remarkable of all—is that of the power of *Conscience*;—the power by which every man is compelled to pass sentence of approbation or condemnation upon himself, on account of his own conduct. When, by means of the Will, the individual is enabled to carry his resolves—the combined result of his mental faculties—into effect, *who* sees not, and feels not, the important uses of this reflex operation of the mind, upon what has been done? In what manner the Conscience acquires the power, and vindicates to itself the right, of approbation and condemna-

* Barrow’s Sermon on the Impiety and Imposition of Paganism and Mahometanism

† Pp. 281, 282.

tion, needs not, for the present purpose, to be decided. The fact is sufficient ; and every one becomes, in consequence, a moral agent—an accountable being. Now, consider man apart from conscience, and there is nothing to restrain him from the exercise of his mental and corporeal faculties to the injury of others :—consider him under the controul of conscience, and he becomes *a law unto himself*. It is scarcely too much to assert that there is not, throughout the whole of external nature, a more striking instance of Divine adaptation, and Divine will, than is here presented. But this is not all. If God designed that man should thus become a moral agent, an accountable being—then has God intimated that HE IS HIMSELF A MORAL GOVERNOR of his intelligent creatures. In the preceding steps of our inquiry, we were enabled to discern the Natural Attributes of the Deity—as his power and wisdom ; together with his benevolence in providing for the physical happiness of his sentient creatures ; but having now taken into account the moral nature of man, as attested by the supremacy of conscience in the human constitution, we catch a glimpse of God's Moral Attribute of Justice—and of his purpose of finally rendering to every one according to his works.” —pp. 84, 85.

Now, Dr. Turton has here asserted that man's moral nature, endowed with *conscience*, furnishes him with the phenomena whence he may as legitimately infer the Divine Justice, as he may from other phenomena infer the Divine Existence. Jeremy Taylor thought so when he wrote, “ It was soberly spoken of Tertulian, ‘ *Conscientia optima testis Divinitatis* ;’ our Conscience is the best argument in the world to prove there is a God. For Conscience is God's deputy ; and the inferior must suppose a superior ; and God and our Conscience are like relative terms, it not being imaginable why some persons in some cases should be amazed and troubled in their minds for their having done a secret turpitude or cruelty ; but that Conscience is present with a message from God, and men feel inward causes of fear, when they are secure from without ; that is, they are forced to fear God, when they are safe from men.”* The doctrine of retribution is thus, in the abstract, as independent of Revelation, as the doctrine of a Divine Existence. Man's Conscience, in all ages, antedates, as it were, a futurity. If man has a moral law within him, that law must have its sanctions. And surely, those sanctions must be drawn, not from this world, where virtue and vice have no inevitable consequents,—but from the other world, where all will be equitably determined. So, we believe, a retributory state is a fact of Natural Religion. True it is, that “ life and immortality were brought to light by the Gospel,” and by the Gospel alone. That is—its true characteristics, its connection with the present, the means of preparation for its blessedness,—these alone

* Ductor Dubitantium, p. 2, fol. 1676.

have come down to us by Revelation. But that there is a state "beyond,"—dark, and shadowy though may be the belief,—is nevertheless inalienable from man's constitution.

Therefore, we contend that Warburton's theory is not only erroneous but dangerous. He traced the belief of the ancients in "rewards and punishments" hereafter, to the legislative wisdom of the philosophers. He did not recollect that though legislative wisdom had thought fit to oppose, instead of cherishing this belief, all their efforts would have been neutralized, until they had eradicated *conscience*.

We have said thus much because it is possible that Dr. Turton's sanction of Warburton might re-introduce that writer's speculations under very favourable auspices; and we have thought it our duty, if possible, to anticipate and obviate, what we honestly conceive would be an evil. The "Divine Legation" will ever be considered a work of extraordinary erudition, and we must add—in agreement with general opinion—a work of extraordinary inefficiency for conviction.

It is very possible that some of our readers will imagine that our foregoing observations concede too much to unassisted reason, and thereby subtract from our obligations to Revelation. This suspicion will, however, we hope, be obviated by recollecting, first, the amount of knowledge respecting a future state, which we contend is ascertainable independently of Christianity, and, secondly, the process by which it is ascertained. We are only arguing that our immortality and attendant retribution are truths as primary as that of the existence of a Deity; and that because—not our intellectual but—our *moral* constitution involves them. We do not say that man solely as a ratiocinative being would find them out,—but we say, that as a *moral* being he has not to find them out, they are "at his right hand." What is Conscience but a bare mental faculty whereby reason can discriminate between certain objects which we intellectually call good, and certain objects which we intellectually call evil,—how can it be called a judge within us,—if it leaves us without the conviction that its decisions will be ratified? What a mock-trial would ever be going on in man's heart,—how fictitious the tribunal,—how useless the adjudicator,—for all *moral* purposes, if to induce a consciousness of merit or demerit was the limit of their power! But fear is the twin-brother of guilt, and hope of virtue,—and both fear and hope live upon *the future*. It is the persuasion that there is a something in the distance which sustains them. Now, such a state of feeling is not a consequent upon Christianity. It existed long before her. It was even in Adam and Eve, immediately upon their transgression, during the moments of their anxious shame,

fearfully modifying the threat, "in the day thou eatest, thou shalt die." And after them it was in the darkest days of Paganism, driving men to cry "Shall I give the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" It is still among the Heathen. Whence the horrors of Hinduism; whence the voluntary immolation beneath the wheels of Juggernaut; whence the forecast of the "red man" as in anticipation of the immortal fields of the "Great Spirit," he pictures to himself forests more trackless,—and prey more noble, in the hunt of which "his faithful dog will bear him company?" Is all this to be attributed to the policy of civil legislation? Or rather, as seems to us irrefragable, to one of those great elements which go to form the ground of man's responsibility?

The theory which would fain assign all this to direct or traditional Revelation, has been and is adopted from an injudicious but well-meant jealousy for the Scriptures. Some of our readers will be surprised to find the company in which it would place them:

"With respect to the power of man to discover, by the light of nature, the being of God, and the truths of what is called Natural Religion, Socinus thought that these principles were above his natural powers, and that the first notices of a Divine Being were derived from Revelation, or immediate communication from God."*

Dr. Turton has supplied us in his volume with the following interesting historical statement upon this subject:—

"During the seventeenth century, the opinions of Socinus did not flourish in this country. The seed was sown, but the ground was not quite prepared for it; nor were there, till after the middle of the eighteenth century, any great signs of vegetation. And the fact is remarkable, that with the increase of Unitarian doctrines—while they were avowedly maintained by some, and regarded with complacency by others—there undoubtedly was a tendency to a revival of the opinions of Socinus, touching Natural Religion. Indications of the existence of such a tendency may be traced even in our own times. I do not quote the late Bishop Watson, as a person symbolizing with the Unitarians, but as one who appears to have felt no dissatisfaction at the progress of their tenets; and we find him thus expressing his sentiments, respecting a future state, in a letter to Mr. Gibbon: 'I have no hope of a future existence except that which is grounded on the truth of Christianity.' The reason subsequently given to THE KING, for such a declaration, is certainly a good one, supposing the doctrine involved to be well founded; but it leaves that point untouched. 'I had,' he says, 'frequently met with respectable men, who cherished an expectation of a future state, though they rejected Christianity as an imposture, and I thought my publicly declaring that I was of a contrary opinion might perhaps induce

* Tombmin's *Memoirs of Faustus Socinus*, 1777, p. 216.

Mr. Gibbon, and other *such* men, to make a deeper investigation into the truth of religion than they had hitherto done.' The late Mr. Gilbert Wakefield's Unitarian principles are well known; and in the course of his writings, he frequently presents the following views: 'The reason why I never took any pleasure in *moral ethics*, and would not give one penny for all the morality in the world, is because there is no foundation for virtue and immortality, but in Revelation: and therefore I could never see any advantage from moral writings.' . . . I do not affirm, nor do I suppose, that such opinions are universally held by Unitarians—although well according with their peculiar views."—p. 208—210.

Our author very philosophically accounts for this disposition, among the Unitarians, to neutralize the value of Natural Religion, upon this principle: the Christianity of the Unitarian, and which he allows to be a Revealed system, differs but little from the system of Natural Religion. Both of them agree very much in their views of the Divine Character and our Moral Obligation: "Is this credible, with regard to a Dispensation (Christianity) promulgated in so wonderful a manner? Now if Natural Religion be an imaginary thing, the difficulty is apparently lessened."

We do not mean to say that this opinion is confined to Unitarianism.

"In the latter part of the seventeenth century—to counteract the mischievous tendency and ill effects, in a practical point of view, of the indiscreet mode in which certain high doctrines had been preached—there were divines of great eminence, who made it their business to impress upon the conscience a serious sense of moral obligation. They dwelt much upon the duties of life. Some of them, unfortunately, called Christianity a Republication of the Law of Nature:—not intending, most assuredly, that Christianity is a *mere* republication, but designing to hold it forth as a Religion abounding in new motives to the observance of all that is required of men in their present state of being. The Adversaries of the Gospel affected to understand what was said, of the 'republication of the law of nature,' in its strictly literal sense; and availed themselves of the opportunity to show, that Christianity is, on that principle, 'as old as the creation.' Controversies arose: in the midst of which appeared certain zealous, but not very prudent, friends of Revelation, whose aim was to prove that there is no such thing as Natural Religion at all. Before the disputes alluded to were closed, a Lay Divine and Religious Philosopher presented to the world some lucubrations which attracted a good deal of notice. 'A very curious and inquisitive person (as Mr. Whiston justly calls him) Mr. HUTCHINSON, thought that, by the light which revelation afforded him, compared with his own observations, he saw farther into the constitution of the universe, and the operations carried on in it, than Sir ISAAC [NEWTON] had done.' Such is the account, given by Bishop Horne, of the philosophy of Hutchinson; who, deriving the principles of 'the constitution of the universe and the operations carried on in it' from Scripture, could scarcely allow

that any thing appertaining to *Religion* could be collected from other sources. Accordingly, we are informed that ‘ he looked upon Natural Religion as Deism in disguise ; an engine of the devil, in these latter days, for the overthrow of the Gospel ; and therefore boldly called it *the Religion of Satan or Antichrist.*’ In such opinions, philosophical and religious, Hutchinson had several followers of great respectability, as the names of Horne, Parkhurst, and Jones, (not to mention others,) will testify ; but the Hutchinsonian philosophy was not formed to endure the scrutiny of the eighteenth century—and the inferences from it, as to religion, would have entirely disappeared, had there not been some attempts to evince their correctness by other considerations. By maintaining the senses to be the only natural inlets to knowledge—that is, by discarding ‘ reflection, on the operations of the mind, as another source of information—Dr. Ellis, the author of a Treatise entitled, *The Knowledge of Divine things from Revelation, not from Reason or Nature*, undertook to prove that neither the being of a God, nor any other principle of religion, could possibly be deduced from the study of the phenomena of the Universe.”—p. 211—213.

Now we shall leave it to our readers to determine, for themselves, whether the doctrines of the Hutchinsonians attribute more true glory to Revelation than the few following remarks, with which we must close this article.

St. Paul has, we think, asserted that “ the voice of Nature is the voice of God.” How otherwise can we interpret his language, “ He hath not left himself without a witness, in that he did good and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness ?” Thus certain beneficial natural phenomena are said to be the proclaimers of one of his attributes, namely, his *goodness*. But Revelation likewise proclaims his goodness ;—would she be more valuable, or more glorious, if her testimony stood *alone* rather than in harmony with another one ?” So too, we contend that certain *moral* phenomena, just as independently of Revelation, are the proclaimers of one of God’s attributes, namely, his *justice*. But Revelation likewise proclaims it ;—is her testimony, because assisted, less precious ? And again, certain *moral* phenomena proclaims a religious doctrine, namely, our obnoxiousness to punishment. But Revelation likewise proclaims it ;—is it unnecessary ? Now, even if they both uttered the same, and only the same attestations ; even if Revealed Religion said so much, but only so much as Natural Religion, “ the mouth of *two* witnesses” would be better than that of *one*. But let us mark, that man had, through darkness and sin, misinterpreted the voice of nature, and the gracious voice of Revelation came to correct the misinterpretation : that in proportion as she is understood nature is understood : that as far as they both allude to the same points, both gloriously agree : that, in fine, Revelation sup-

plies the deficiency of her colleague, "what was dark illumines,"—brings out, in more blessed definiteness, the lineaments of the Divine love; and in more striking grandeur and awfulness the Almighty's frown;—and with unhesitating minuteness peoples the fear that had been shadowy, and strengthens the hope that had been feeble.

Let us mark, that the Gospel came to pronounce a testimony peculiarly her own,—and as no mean instrument whereby to gain credit to this exclusive attestation she proved her affinity with another testimony that had been credited already. Let a heathen himself decide. Because he had felt God's kindness before and faintly hoped in it,—and because he had felt God's justice before and had trembled at it,—will he the less value that Gospel which accords with both these primary presumptions of his moral nature, and declares the Almighty to be "in Christ" a Deity of Mercy,—but "out of Christ" a Deity of Equitable Vengeance? "Life and immortality were brought *to light* by the Gospel." Does the endangered mariner value the sun less because it brings to light an anchorage which he *knew* was near him, but which he could not master?

Dr. Turton has done much service to the Church in protesting against a theory which, by arrogating too much to Religion, endangers the forfeiture of all. We would unflatteringly tell him, that much importance though we attach to Lord Brougham's Discourse, and likewise to this his notice of it,—yet we think him of too learned and too independent a mind to be merely a commentator. In his Preface, as one of the reasons for his publication, he says, with much modesty, "there probably was no disinclination to leave some permanent foot-marks, on ground over which I had been accustomed to wander from my earliest years." We are not content with these indices of his path; he must give us the full scenery to which it led him.

ART. III.—*Psalms and Hymns adapted to the Services of the Church of England*. London: Wix, 1836.

THE want of uniformity in the congregational Psalmody of the Establishment, and the licence which has been consequently assumed in many of our churches and chapels, constitute a not unimportant matter, which, for some time, has been forcing itself, more and more, upon the public notice. We have, ourselves, expressed our sentiments on more occasions than one: and, in the first instance, we were accused of laxity, even by valued friends, for hinting objections to the two authorized versions of

the Psalms of David, and for desiring that official steps should be taken in the business. But the continuance,—or rather the growth—of the evil has at length made men sensible of its effects and patient of its remedy. If there were but one metrical translation of the Psalms, and that one were in universal use, we should have paused long—whatever our private opinion of its merits—before we had ventured even a single word to shake the confidence of others in its favour. But since there are two,—and both of them are confessedly bad,—we can perceive no valid reason, why there should not be a third. Again, since, *because* they are bad, all sorts of collections are smuggled into our places of worship, we can perceive no valid reason, why a *good* collection should not be made and encouraged. At least, whether it be feasible, or not, immediately to fix one uniform practice, there are certain irregular and injurious practices, which ought immediately to be stopped. For some persons are introducing their own hymns into our service, in a manner almost as objectionable, as if they were introducing their own litany and their own prayers. But here we would refer to the words of a Prelate of our Church, who has lately addressed a most judicious and valuable letter to his brethren upon the subject. The existing mischief is pointed out in that brief, but impressive, publication, with calmness and with wisdom, with eloquence and with authority.

The editor of the *Christian Remembrancer*, or, as we shall say, for the sake of avoiding circumlocution, since we have seen the name specified in a prospectus, Mr. Hall, has brought forward his work, partly, we suppose, with the hope of remedying this lamentable and crying grievance. This compilation, too, comes before us with this adventitious advantage, that it is dedicated, by permission, to the Bishop of London, and published with the sanction, although not exactly under the immediate auspices, of his lordship. The mitre upon the sides of the cover, will, we doubt not, introduce it into many places of worship, to which it might not otherwise have found its way. The object is indeed one in which an indefatigable and sagacious prelate might well take a kind and active interest: nor do we mean to insinuate that the collection itself is unworthy of the patronage which has been bestowed. Mr. Hall, as we have good authority for believing, has devoted to it much labour and much time. He has obviously set about the task, as a man who felt its importance, and was determined to execute it to the best of his ability. There are every where internal evidences of great care, great industry, and very sedulous revision. This new compilation, therefore, of Psalms and Hymns, will be to many Christians, and more especially to many

parochial clergymen, a very welcome and acceptable production. It is not a failure: yet we can scarcely hail it as an achievement of very brilliant success. It is the best, perhaps, which we have: but very far from being the best which we can conceive. It may be an improvement upon its predecessors: but it certainly does not preclude, or render hopeless, the attempt of making an improvement upon itself.

The objects and plan of the work may be gathered from the preface; as also the obligations under which the compiler lies to different friends, and the degree of responsibility—certainly not very considerable—which is incurred by the Bishop of London in affording his encouragement.

“Selections of Psalms and Hymns are already so numerous, that any addition may perhaps appear superfluous. The compiler of the present volume has, however, met with none, in his judgment, so fully calculated to promote uniformity in this part of divine worship, as to forbid the present attempt.

“His leading object has been to select those portions of every Psalm which best illustrate its general subject, and are calculated to be practically useful; together with such Hymns as, elevating and warming the heart, without inflaming the imagination or offending the judgment, may at once, by their expression and sentiment, commend themselves both to the educated and to the unlettered Christian. Portions of four verses only have been chosen, in compliance with the custom which has obtained in most of our churches, except where the unity of the subject required an addition.

“Besides the *occasional* Hymns, four have been so applied to every Sunday in the year as to illustrate the subjects and unity of the services appointed for the day. Thus, the subjects of the Hymns for the first Sunday in Advent are respectively—‘Acknowledgment of Guilt,’—‘Prayer for Sanctification,’—‘The Coming and Reign of Messiah,’—and ‘The Blessings of Christ’s Advent.’ A reference to the Morning Lesson, the Epistle, the Evening Lesson, and the Gospel for the day, will show the connexion. A similar unity will be found in the services for every Sunday throughout the year, and in the Hymns which are applied to them.

“To each Hymn are prefixed a heading descriptive of its subject, and a reference to a passage of Scripture in the services for the day. The name of an appropriate tune is also applied to every Psalm and Hymn.

“The work is published in octavo, 18mo, and 24mo. To the octavo edition four indexes are added: one, of the first lines of the Psalms and Hymns; another, to direct the choice of Psalms proper for the different parts of the service, by classing them, as far as they would allow, according to their respective characters, whether of praise,—penitence and supplication,—or precept; a third, of the subjects of the Psalms and Hymns; and a fourth, of the Texts of Scripture illustrated. By this arrangement, the clergy may be enabled readily to select a Psalm or Hymn adapted to a particular discourse.

"The editor has now the grateful task of acknowledging his obligations to many friends for their valuable contributions, and especially for the kindness and judgment with which they examined the successive sheets. To one he owes peculiar thanks—not only for his continued and friendly assistance during the progress of the work, but also for his very liberal contribution of original Psalms and Hymns; many of the latter having been written upon subjects which had hitherto remained untouched. He is also bound to acknowledge with gratitude the condescension of the distinguished prelate to whom the volume is inscribed, in permitting the sheets, after they had received all the improvements which the various criticisms of friends could suggest, to be submitted to himself for his general opinion; beyond which the editor would not be understood as claiming the sanction of his lordship's approval.

"The glory of God, exemplified in 'the unsearchable riches of Christ,' is the great end contemplated in this selection. That in ministering to this object it may promote the comfort and edification of 'the followers of the Lamb,' is the fervent prayer with which it is affectionately commended to the members of the Church of England."

A regular plan, such as Mr. Hall's, undoubtedly possesses a very decided advantage over the usual miscellanies: and some tribute of approbation is due to every man, who makes a fair and well-digested attempt at enlisting the charms of music and poetry on the side of religion. This collection, too, possesses the *negative*, yet most salutary, merit of rejecting all prurient phrases, all questionable modes of address to the Being, who is infinite and eternal, all undue and offensive familiarity with the sacred name of the Redeemer. Its *positive* value we cannot regard as being very transcendant. For the misfortune is, that in extracting the nauseous expressions from certain Hymns, which the editor has inserted in his catalogue, he has sometimes managed to squeeze out the poetry. The volatile essence of enthusiasm has been evaporated; and the *residuum* is dull and vapid enough. The general fault is a stiffness, a cramped hardness, a pervading want of the gush, and unction, and ardour of holy thought; where imagination heightens devotion, and yet devotion chastens imagination. Hence this his compilation somewhat resembles a staid, decorous, respectable person, who will never be guilty of any solecism in behaviour; but who has scarcely a single particle of vivacity and fire in his composition: while, now and then, an effusion occurs, which can only remind us of a versification of a schoolboy's theme, put into rhyme, by the way, not always the most harmonious or the most exact.

The reason for this deficiency may be, that, in addition to the universal and acknowledged difficulties of devotional poetry, Mr. Hall has fettered himself by limits, even stricter, we should say, than any trammels which could be essentially necessary to the

nature of his design. His Psalms and Hymns are confined, almost without an exception, to the dimension of four stanzas, or sixteen lines; they are lopped to a precise size and shape, as if they had been made by the square inch; or as if the true canon of Psalmody was a foot-rule. We had really thought, that this Procrustean process had been confined to sonnets and old New-digate prize poems. Some boundaries are, of course, requisite; but more liberty, we think, might have been taken with advantage; and, perhaps, even a practical utility might have been secured, by giving portions of two stanzas or of six; so as to equalize rather than derange the time of service, and form an adjustment to the different length of Psalms, or Lessons, Epistle and Gospel, or Sermon. At any rate, we have our fears, that in cutting the pieces by so uniform and inflexible a measure, Mr. Hall has reduced many a production of verdant promise into a kind of "*triste lignum*;" a dry, hard chip from which all the sap, and juice and succulence have departed.

A doubt, moreover, may be reasonably entertained, whether the editor is aware, how much of the glow and current of a poetical fancy may be made perfectly compatible with the soberness of genuine piety and the best decencies of public worship. As a test of his taste and temperament in such matters, we turned at once to the hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm. That most beautiful and affecting of odes stands in his collection as follows:—

" PSALM CXXXVII.

Devoted Love to the Church in her Affliction.

LEBBEUS. D. L. M.

When Israel sat by Babel's stream,
Their harps were on the willows hung;
Of Sion was their mournful dream,
Sad were their tears, their harps unstrung:
With taunting scorn their haughty foes
Taught them what fate to slaves belongs;
Proud in their power, they mock'd their woes,
And ask'd for Sion's sacred songs.

For Sion's songs? ah thought abhorr'd!
How, Salem, could they sing of thee;
Or tell the praises of the Lord,
While in their sad captivity?
O Sion! to remember thee
Shall ever be thy sons' employ;
Thy woes their heaviest grief shall be,
Thy happiness their highest joy."

The last stanza, more especially the wretched turn, or conceit,

in the concluding lines, may raise a strong doubt as to Mr. Hall's capacity for giving us a collection, which will do justice to the sweet Psalmist of Israel; or adequately supply what is so much needed in the congregational services of the Church of England. This compilation, it appears to us, goes upon the principle of partly adopting the authorized versions of the Psalms, and partly altering and curtailing them "*ad libitum*." We may adduce the first Psalm as a specimen:—

“ PSALM I.

The Blessedness of the Righteous.

ST. ANN'S. C. M.

How blest is he who ne'er consents
By ill advice to walk;
Nor stands in sinners' ways, nor sits
Where scorers love to talk.

But makes the perfect law of God
His study and delight;
Devoutly reads therein by day,
And meditates by night.

Like some fair tree, which, fed by streams,
Its fruit in season bears,
His life shall prosper, and success
Attend his latest years.

For God approves the just man's ways;
To happiness they tend;
But all the paths that sinners tread
In sure destruction end.”

But the editor is by no means contented with emendations of Messrs. Sternhold and Hopkins, or Messrs. Brady and Tate. Even in the Hymns, and in old and established favourites, there are many alterations, which are certainly not improvements. This is much to be lamented; for alterations, in such cases, always jar upon the mind, and grate upon the ear; and, unless it be very decidedly and very palpably for the better, every change runs an imminent hazard of being denounced as a melancholy mutilation. Let us take the Morning and Evening Hymns according to the present version:—

“ MORNING.

Holy Resolution and Gratitude.

CAMBERWELL. L. M.

Awake, my soul, and with the sun
Thy daily stage of duty run;
Shake off dull sloth, and early rise
To pay thy morning sacrifice.

Redeem thy misspent moments past,
 And live this day as if thy last ;
Thy talents to improve take care ;
For the great day thyself prepare.

Glory to God, who safe has kept,
 And has refresh'd me while I slept ;
 Grant, Lord, that when from death I wake,
 I may of endless life partake.

Direct, control, suggest, this day,
 All I design, or do, or say ;
 That all my powers, with all their might,
 In thy sole glory may unite."

" EVENING.

Confiding in God's gracious Care.

MAGDALEN. L. M.

Glory to thee, my God, this night,
 For all the blessings of the light ;
 Keep me, O keep me, King of kings,
 Beneath thy own almighty wings.

Forgive me, Lord, for thy dear Son,
 The ill which I this day have done ;
 That with the world, myself and thee,
 I, ere I sleep, at peace may be.

Teach me to live, that I may dread
 The grave as little as my bed ;
 Teach me to die, that so I may
 With joy behold the judgment-day.

Lord, let my soul for ever share
 The bliss of thy paternal care :
'Tis heaven on earth, 'tis heaven above,
To see thy face, and sing thy love.

Praise God, &c."

What can we say for the lines here printed in italics, or who is responsible for them? There is really something droll in the idea of Mr. Hall now correcting Bishop Ken, and now making improvements upon Reginald Heber. Delightful is it, we must say, in such a compilation as this, to catch a Scriptural image or an old familiar hymn. How do the well-known odes, the 56th and 57th, for instance, shine out among the novelties, for which we are indebted to Mr. Hall and his friends! Passing over a good deal of most unpoetical loyalty, in which the changes are rung upon "*save the king,*" and "*bless our king,*" and "*guide our king,*" we would ask, what can be more bald or prosaic than the effusion which we subjoin, upon the inspiring topic of the

"CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES?"

"Sion's promised Glory a Motive to joyful Worship."

WARWICK. C. M.

Behold the mountain of the Lord

In latter days shall rise,

Exalted high above the hills,

And draw the wond'ring eyes.

To this the joyful nations round,

All tribes and tongues shall flow;

Up to the hill of God, they'll say,

And to his house we'll go!

The light that shines from Sion's hill

Shall lighten ev'ry land:

The King who reigns in Sion's towers

Shall all the world command.

Then come, ye favour'd of the Lord,

To worship at his shrine;

And, humbly walking in his light,

With holy beauty shine."

It would, however, be most disingenuous to contend that there is nothing better to be found in this collection. Hymn 298, is a far more favourable specimen.

"FUNERALS."

Reflections on Mortality.

CROWLE. C. M.

Beneath our feet and o'er our head

Is equal warning given;

Beneath us lie the countless dead,

Above us is the heaven.

Their names are graven on the stone,

Their bones are in the clay;

And ere another day is gone,

Ourselves may be as they.

Turn, mortal, turn! thy danger know;

Where'er thy foot can tread,

The earth rings hollow from below,

And warns thee of her dead.

Turn, Christian, turn! thy soul apply

To truths divinely giv'n;

The bones that underneath thee lie

Shall live for hell or heaven."

There is power, too, in the 37th hymn, and in the 46th which we proceed to quote:—although, in both, the rhymes might have attained a nicer accuracy.

"The Hypocrite and Disobedient condemned.

(Isa. lvii. 12, 13.)

JUDGMENT. P. M.

Jehovah hath spoken! the nations shall hear;
 From the east to the west shall his glory appear;
 With thunders and tempests to judgment he'll come;
 And all men before him shall wait for their doom.

Thou formal professor! thou saint but in name!
 Where now wilt thou cover thy guilt and thy shame,
 When thy sin long conceal'd shall be blazon'd abroad,
 And thy conscience shall echo the sentence of God!

Wo—wo to the sinners! to what shall they trust
 In the day of God's vengeance, the holy and just!
 How meet all the terrors that flame in his path,
 When the mountains shall melt at the glance of his wrath!

O God! ere the day of thy mercy be past,
 With trembling our souls on that mercy we cast:
 O guide us in wisdom; for aid we implore;
 Till, sav'd with thy people, thy grace we adore."

The 44th is an instance of our meaning, when we ventured to remark, that some of these compositions put us in mind of a short but serious essay turned into verse, the thoughts being crowded and indistinct, the expressions flat and feeble.

"The Christian Character meek and forgiving.

(Rom. xii. 21.)

BRUNSWICK. L. M.

The holy gospel we profess
 Is truth and mercy, peace and love;
 Such, let our hearts and lives express;
 Such, let our conversation prove.

Whene'er the angry passions rise,
 And tempt our thoughts or tongues to strife,
 To Jesus let us lift our eyes,
 Bright pattern of the christian life.

Dispensing good where'er he came,
 The labour of his life was love:
 If then we love the Saviour's name,
 That love let our obedience prove.

But ah! how blind, how weak we are;
 How frail! how apt to turn aside!
 Lord, we depend upon thy care,
 And seek thy Spirit for our guide."

On the whole, we give Mr. Hall the fullest credit for his excellent intentions; but we cannot think that he has quite reached

the goal of his own ambition; or quite supplied the *desideratum* which by many ministers and members of the Establishment has been long and almost painfully felt. He has engaged, we may repeat, in a work of extreme difficulty; but that difficulty has been rather valiantly met than triumphantly overcome. Some will be of opinion, that we have attached too much importance to his efforts; and others, that we have spoken of them with too great severity. Our own impression, however, is, that a compilation of Psalms and Hymns, which aspires to be generally admitted into the churches and chapels of the Establishment, is a very momentous undertaking; and that it *ought* to be tried by a very high standard, both in a religious and in a poetical point of view. Our wish, we confess, is to see suitable portions, not merely of the Psalms, but of other portions of Scripture—such as parts of the Book of Job, of Isaiah, of the magnificent odes which are scattered through the historical books of the Old Testament, of the affecting passages, which make our hearts thrill in the New, translated and adapted to music by the living authors most competent to the task, such as Southey, Milman, Keble, and many others whom we could name. In the mean time, although the original attempts are not always the happiest; and although there are some perilous experiments at alteration, which could only be justified by complete success, and which have not always that justification; we shall do wrong quite to turn aside from Mr. Hall's compilation. We repeat, that, as far as we know, there is nothing better of the kind *in esse*, although there may be something infinitely better *in posse*. And Mr. Hall may well bid us be thankful to him, at least as a pioneer, and accept his collection with gratitude, at least until we can find one superior to supersede it. He may well think, that, until we can live in "*the best of all possible worlds*," it is idle to wait for the best of all possible Psalms and Hymns. He may well appeal to an objector with the somewhat stale quotation,—

—————"Si quid novisti rectius istis,
Candidus imperti; si non, *his utere mecum*."

It remains to be added, that, besides this compilation, to which the particular circumstances attending its appearance have attracted our especial notice, we see announced a collection of Psalms and Hymns by the Rev. J. E. Riddle; another has been recently put forth by the Rev. E. Scobell: and a third, we believe,—for "another and another still succeeds,"—is in preparation under the joint superintendence of Messrs. Tomlinson and Dukinfield. Our sincere hope is, that so much competition will lead to excellence; and so in its ultimate effect to uniformity.

ART. IV.—*Kurze Geschichte der Päpste; nebst einem Anhang über den Primat Petri und das Märchen von der Päpstin Johanna*, von D. Wilhelm Smets. Dritte Auflage. Köln. 1835.

MOST men, says a well-known Greek historian,* instituting no laborious research after truth, ἐπὶ τὰ ἑτοιμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται. We naturally like to look at things, not as they are, but as it is convenient for us that they should be. We delight in objects ready arranged and prepared to admit of our contemplating them from the most convenient position and with as little trouble as possible. And hence arises within us a constant, though perhaps an unconscious, desire to construct individualities; to bring, in thought, things connected with each other into masses; and then, as it were, to give a personal existence to systems, dynasties, empires, or chains of events; ascribing to the respective unities which we choose to behold in them, broad and general characteristics, deduced, of course, from our impressions respecting the working of these subjects of our speculation in such parts of their fields of operation as have been more immediately brought under our notice.

From some such popular mental process as this has arisen, it is probable, the habit now prevalent among us of viewing as one thing—as an individuality possessing, so to say, an inseparable personal character,—the system of the dominion of the Papacy. What that dominion has been in the times with the history of which we are most conversant,—what it is now, wherever, as in a neighbouring island, it still shows symptoms of life and vigour,—men know, or think they know, by abundant experience. And hence, by bringing that dominion from its infancy to the present hour into one field of view,—by ascribing to it one permanent habit and principle of action rather than that succession of habits and principles which might with greater plausibility be conceived to characterize a power existing through many centuries,—by making of it, in short, an individual object of contemplation, they settle down, unhesitatingly, in the conviction that such as it is now, such, in itself, it always was; and they acquire the custom of predicating fearlessly of its whole historical career the characteristics which they know but as being incidentally connected with its present, or at any rate its recent, phase. Men speak of the papal power as opposed to the diffusion of knowledge and to the enlightenment of mankind; as more especially averse to the study of the Scriptures by lay members of the Church; as friendly

* Thucyd. lib. i. c. 20.

to despotism, and consequently hostile to the reasonable rights and liberties of nations; and as habitually supporting a corrupt system of Christianity in opposition to the true religion of the Gospel. And that this character, if applied to the conduct of the conclave during the last two or three centuries, is, in the main, unjust, we will not undertake to maintain. But two or three centuries form but a small portion of the recorded duration of the papal power; and a careful consideration even of this character, as standing by itself, and without direct reference to the history of remoter times, might suffice to show us how fallacious must be the reasoning which would ascribe it to any long existing system, as a permanent and necessary, rather than as a temporary and accidental definition. We might, even *à priori*, see that many features of such a character exist but in relation to things variable in their nature and foreign to the true internal essence of the system which it is intended to describe. The accuracy, for instance, of the last clause of the description would mainly depend, not on the abstract position, or on the actual temperament of the Papacy, but on the nature of the elements, religious or political, which might at any given period be found to be opposed to it. It would not, as a matter of course, or by a necessary consequence, follow, from the fact of the assertion of a corrupt theology, that the assertor would at all times have to defend it against a purer system. It might certainly be impugned because it was *corrupt*; but it might also be attacked because it was *theology*. It might—and, if amid its corruption it held any great doctrines of the truth, it probably would—find assailants from below—if we may so say—as well as from above;—from the ranks of infidelity as well as from those of pure Christianity. And thus a system, even though itself unchanged, might at one epoch be justly described as opposing the truth, and at another designated with equal justice the antagonist of error.

Again, with respect to the position of the papal power viewed in relation to the struggles between monarchs and their subjects; this is evidently a position which must at all times have been mainly determined by matters external to that power itself; a position which must have fluctuated with the constant fluctuations of European politics; and which it were clearly an error to incorporate into a definition, intended as a permanent and essential one, of the spirit of Romish ecclesiastical dominion.

We are, in truth, with respect to the Papacy, mainly led into the adoption of the fallacious mode of reasoning above described by the ignorance so generally prevalent among us of one most important fact, namely, that Popery, and by consequence the

papal power, underwent, at the epoch of the Reformation, a marked and sudden change of character.

We commonly, but carelessly, acquiesce in the notion—fatal as, were it true, it would prove to the Catholicism of our English Church—that the religion now taught by the Church of Rome, was the religion once spread over Western Europe, our own island included, and that our Protestant doctrines are comparatively new among us. Whereas, the fact is, that the religion of existing Rome, as far as relates to those particulars in which it differs from our own, is, in strictness, a new religion, having its origin with the ever-to-be lamented Council of Trent. The peculiar notions which, according to our current phraseology, stamp on the religion with which they are connected, the title “Popery,” had indeed, previously to the date of that Council, extensively prevailed in our own as in other countries. Insensibly had they crept in, some sooner and some later, and imperceptibly had they become amalgamated with the current faith of our people. But the Reformers detected these insidious innovations. As such—as innovations—they embodied against them that series of protests commonly known by the name of the Thirty-nine Articles. At that period* it was that Rome, stung by this rejection of doctrines in which the credit of her existing authorities was involved, adopted the bold—the unprecedented—step of formally incorporating these doctrines so completely with her religion as to make the reception of them a necessary condition for participation in her communion. And this step it is which virtually separates us from that communion at the present hour. We commonly think and speak of our Reformers as though they had separated themselves from the Romish Church and put her to the ban.† But such is not the fact; for aught that they have done we could communicate with her now; but we know that, should we attempt to do so, she would put forth this list of novel dogmas of faith, and call upon us either to subscribe it or to depart from her altars.

* The Thirty-nine Articles were adopted by our Church in 1562. The Bull of Pius IV., which promulgated the Tridentine Creed, bore date November, 1564.

† This notion is set forth in a pamphlet lately published by Mr. Bickersteth. He says, “It was this view of Popery which led our Reformers to a decided separation from the church of Rome. As God commanded the Jews to come out of Babylon of old, so he explicitly commands those in modern Babylon, by a voice from heaven, to separate from her. . . . It is not lawful to separate from a pure Church of Christ. It is a positive duty to go out from the fallen Church of Rome.” But let us, against this, set the more historical view of Mr. Dodsworth. “Common as the notion is in our day, that our Church did so separate, there never was a more groundless notion, or one more contrary to fact. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND NEVER SEPARATED FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME, OR FROM ANY OTHER CHURCH.” *Vide* The Church of England a Protester against Romanism and Dissent. No. I.

And though, as we have admitted, these erroneous tenets were held by many—nay, were generally prevalent in the Western Church at the opening of the Reformation,—antecedently, that is, to the date of the Tridentine assembly; yet the admission, by any, of doctrines uncontroverted and unquestioned in their time,—the reception of them, vaguely and undoubtingly, from the influence of habit, example, or education, or upon the broad principle of deference to undisputed authority,—is a very different thing from an adoption of those doctrines when clearly defined, when formally incorporated into a creed, and when asserted in open and notorious opposition to their contradicting verities. Even those, therefore, who were, antecedently to the Council of Trent, the most Popish, if we may so say, in principle, embraced, in adopting the formulary propounded by that council, a religion which was in one sense, and that a most important one, new to them.

Assertors as they were of this novel religion, the position of the successors of St. Peter became also, in some material points, a new one; and the policy, the temper, the moral tone of the Vatican, must needs have undergone considerable remoulding from the change. Even without, therefore, taking into account the general improbability of the maintenance, by a succession of men, through a long series of ages, of what may be called an individual character, we have in our knowledge of this one historical fact sufficient reason to deter us, in the case of the Papacy, from pronouncing decisively our verdict on the past, from the relative, the incidental, the transitory, characteristics of the present.

And the same great change which has thus given to the power in question a new character, has in great measure disqualified us from passing an accurate judgment upon its old one. The reformation of our English Church, necessary, beneficial, blessed, as was the event, was, as a sudden and violent change, necessarily productive of some of those incidental evils by which such changes ever will and must be accompanied. And one of these unfortunate results was, unquestionably, that revulsion of feeling, attendant upon the crisis, which, as it were, wrenched us forcibly from the past; which led us to look on that past with a gaze, not of Christian reverence, but of unchristian suspicion; teaching us that the antiquity of a practice or tenet of religion was rather a reason for shrinking from and abandoning it, than for dutifully receiving or observing it. It is not, of course, our Reformers whom we would blame for the rise of this feeling. Having designated the Reformation necessary, we have already virtually ascribed the evils incidentally connected with the change to the

agency of those causes which made that change inevitable. Forced, even for the sake of preserving our Church's purity, to sever the bonds of association which linked our minds to those of our forefathers, our guides almost involuntarily untaught us the duty of tracing up our faith through the annals of other days, and of distinguishing from heretical schemes, the date of whose respective rises could be clearly made out, that system of doctrine "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est ;"* thus to a certain extent imbuing us, even while our orders and discipline yet demonstrated our Catholicity, with the moral tone and temperament of low sectarianism.

Through the influence of some such feelings as this it is that the church history of the long period between the very earliest times of Christianity and the opening of the sixteenth century has become to most of us a blank page. The intervening ages appear dark to us, and such we call them ; forgetting, while we do so, that the effect of darkness may be produced either by the want of light upon an object contemplated or by that of visual power in the eye which strives to behold it. And amid this darkness—absolute or relative, or both—some of the few figures which we are able to discern, glare luridly upon us with preternatural proportions ; while others, dimly and uncertainly made out from the encompassing vacancy, suggest ideas totally different from those which the sight of the same things, surrounded by their usual accompaniments, and illumined by the radiance of day, would probably occasion.

It is under such disadvantages as these that we ordinarily contemplate the rise and early growth of that extraordinary moral empire which, unsupported by, or rather opposed to, physical power, succeeded during the middle ages to a pre-eminence which had till then been conceded to the iron hand of military force alone. Learning from the history of more modern times what the character of the papal power has recently been,—applying that character to times in which we see of that power no more than the dim outline of its rise,—and in total ignorance of the position in relation to other powers in which, at the period of that rise, it was placed,—we view in it, from its origin, as has been already remarked, a power inimical to purity alike of faith and of manners,—to the rights as well of sovereigns as of their subjects,—to knowledge,—to virtue,—and, in fine, to Christianity itself. We come to regard its whole existence as a devastating phenomenon ;—as one of those destructive dispensations

* See the *Commonitorium* of Vincentius Lirinensis. This invaluable little treatise should be in the hands of every churchman whose classical attainments will enable him to master some fifty or sixty pages of easy Latinity.

of the Almighty which nothing but a confirmed faith can enable us to regard as compatible either with His revealed or with His discoverable attributes. We fix, as well as we can, what we consider the exact epoch of its appearance, and reckon up from that the 'years which have since elapsed, as though wondering that the continuance of such a pest through so lengthened a period should have been foredoomed in the councils of Heaven.

And yet, utterly as such an *impassioned* view, so to call it, would seem to disqualify him who entertains it from discharging the duties of a historian, it is to England, and to England alone, that we look with hope for the eventual filling up of that void in the historical literature of Europe, a clear and satisfactory narration of the rise of the papal power. Germany has sons indefatigable in research and profound in thought. Far be it from us to despise or depreciate the exertions of her Schröckhs, her Plancks, her Gieselers. As collectors of intelligence—as accumulators of a great mass of facts, from which all future church historians must derive the most valuable assistance,—they have laboured arduously and well. But Germany, from the line unfortunately adopted by those who conducted her Reformation, contains none who are alike within the pale of the Catholic Church—as that term was understood in early times—and without the pale of Romanism. Her Protestants are formed into communities, each of which, as such, commenced its existence with the great convulsive change of the sixteenth century, branching off and separating itself from that great apostolic Institution which has, by the golden chain of the ministerial succession, been providentially preserved among ourselves. There exists not, therefore, in their case, the possibility of that identification of one's self with the past,—of that habitual and involuntary sympathy with the fortunes of the Church, through all the stages of her history,—which a member of her Anglican branch, if he understand his true position, will necessarily feel; and without which the efforts of the ecclesiastical historian will ever be inadequate suitably to embody the majesty of his subject.

The Romish writers of Germany do not, of course, participate in this particular disqualification. Yet it is not to them that, belonging as we do to a reformed Church, we can look for a satisfactory delineation of any portion of history with which the Papacy is directly concerned. Indeed, the existence of papal power, in its most important features, from the very foundation of the Church, is a portion of the Romanist's creed. The growth, consequently, of that power in the middle ages, he would be the last to describe, or even to examine, in detail.

Dr. Smets, with the title of whose compendious "History of

the Popes" we have headed this Article, belongs to this latter class of German writers. His work was published in that ancient seat of ecclesiastical authority, the archiepiscopal city of Cologne. And his object in compiling it appears to have been to supply his co-religionists with what he conceived an antidote to the cheap publications which have inundated the German press, and have fostered in every possible way the light and irreverent spirit of the age. "To the hostility of that spirit," says Dr. Smets, "the clerical office—the ministry of the Catholic Church, in its various grades and orders, is above all things exposed." A remark in which, we need not say, we fully concur with him. The experience of our English branch of the Church Catholic hourly proves the fact. And we much wish to see that spirit more fully encountered among ourselves by means analogous to those suggested to his fellow Romanists by Dr. Smets;—by attempts to render familiar to the minds of our countrymen the history of the Church, and the commission and authority of her ministers.

But, short as is the work of Dr. Smets altogether, it is, for the reason above given, as the work of a Romanist, peculiarly brief and unsatisfactory respecting the point to which we wish at present to direct attention. We have therefore alluded to that work rather with the view of giving our own views, derived from general sources, of the subject in question, than of attempting any direct analysis of the little volume before us. And we have chosen that volume for the purpose rather than any of the more elaborate histories with which Germany abounds, because, differing so widely as we do and must in our views from both classes of her writers, we should—had we undertaken to review any thing more considerable than a compendium—have been compelled to confuse what we now hope to lay simply and uninterruptedly before our readers, a general account of a most important passage in the Church's history, by digressions on matters connected with some individual author, or by discussions on points of controverted principle.

Those who, averting their eyes from the crude and hastily formed notions to which they are accustomed, could bring themselves calmly and impartially to contemplate the great historical phenomenon which the rise of the papal domination presents to our notice, would assuredly find the contemplation fraught with interest and instruction of no ordinary nature. That in an age of rudeness, of violence, and of ignorance, an authority should rise up, based on conscience and supported by spiritual sanctions alone;—that this authority, led by circumstances to confront that of the proudest monarchs of the world, should upon trial be

found superior to it, the diadem being abased before the tiara, the sword of empire before the crook of pastoral authority;—that all this should be, of a surety betokens the agency of some higher and more refined principle than is developed in the exaltation of a common earthly empire. And when we recollect, in addition to this, that the power thus strangely rising based its moral energy upon the faith—fearfully corrupted, perhaps, and disfigured—but still upon the faith, the deep conviction of mankind that the Gospel was true, we have unquestionably strong cause for suspecting that the revolution in human affairs by which its elevation was accomplished, was not one fraught with unmitigated evil.

That revolution, like all others of a moral nature, was in truth the gradual work of ages; though its more apparent process, or, in other words, its crisis, took place during the latter portion of the eleventh century, while the councils of the Vatican were guided by the celebrated Hildebrand, who for the last twelve years of his life filled the Papal chair under the name of Gregory the Seventh. This personage, commonly regarded among us as a sort of type or impersonation of the system with the predominance of which he was connected, participates, by a natural consequence, in the odium with which that system itself is habitually regarded. Our ordinary ideas on the subject are, indeed, far too vague to admit of our recognizing, in the agents of a work thus beheld in the mass, individualities separate and distinct from that which we ascribe to the mass itself. And even if, inquiring rather farther than is usual into the subject, we arrive at the knowledge of certain peculiar features of character as having distinguished individual actors in the distant scene, this very knowledge, through the peculiarity of our position, will sometimes mislead and confuse us, rather than guide us in the formation of true judgments or accurate ideas; for the errors, the peculiarities, and the fancies of those times were not only different from, but, if we may so say, contrary to, those of our own age. The violent change of the Reformation did much more than cause the annihilation of certain erroneous modes of thought and systematic prejudices; it established in the Protestant mind a tendency to opposite modes, opposite imaginations. And he, therefore, who, with exclusively Protestant training, looks at the character of a pope of the middle ages, will, it is probable, be startled by much that he sees, not on account of its variance from the true standard of perfection, but on account of the discrepancy between it and a standard fixed by himself—if the expression may be allowed—on the opposite side of the truth. The errors and heresies of our own time are, it is probable, but exaggerations or distorted ex-

pressions of notions in some degree current in our own breasts; they find within us something which, in a measure at least, responds to them; and, indeed, the very familiarity which, if we move in the world, we must acquire alike with their theory and their practice, deadens our minds, if to nothing more, at least to the strangeness, the apparent unaccountability, of such delusions; while the faults and follies of ages and states of society widely different from our own come to us not only unsoftened by any such palliating influences on the mind, but as it were heightened by the circumstance of their standing out in contrast with the habitual tone and current of our thoughts. And thus it is that the errors in faith and practice of Hildebrand and his contemporary Churchmen,—errors which we by no means wish in themselves to palliate,—the invocation, for instance, of saints,—the degradation of one of the sacraments by the reception of the doctrine of transubstantiation,—and the abasement of the spiritual kingdom of the Church by its assimilation to the temporal monarchies which surrounded it;—these, and such as these, call forth in us a degree of horror, we do not say absolutely, but relatively misplaced. Nor does it ever occur to us, while openly expressing with regard to them the sentiments which they excite in us, that Hildebrand and his contemporaries might, perhaps, have shrunk, with a not less well-founded horror, from other practices and tenets, which, from their familiarity to ourselves, hardly call forth from us even a casual sentence of reprehension. What might not the energetic pontiff of the eleventh century have said of the general abandonment of public worship on six days out of the seven? What of the almost universal disregard of Church authority evinced in the systematic non-observance of festivals? What of an avowed and legalized system of putting up spiritual offices to sale? Or what of the cold-hearted denial of the grace conferred by the holy Sacrament of Baptism, on the ground that the sacred gift is impalpable to our gross and earthly senses?

These suggestions in favour of the more immediate fabricators of papal dominion, are, it will be seen, only made, as the phrase is, *ad homines*; they can but defend these prelates in relation to ourselves,—not absolutely, or with respect to truth in the abstract. That Hildebrand and his coadjutors professed a theology, to a fearful extent superstitious and erroneous, is undeniable; that they felt within, in their souls, and exhibited to the world in many points of their practice, the evil tendencies of such a deteriorated faith, follows from this admission as a necessary inference. But while we look, as we unquestionably do, on the errors of our day just alluded to as compatible with a sincere faith in the Gospel, and with the maintenance, in the main, of a Christian

character, it behoves us seriously to consider the grounds which justify us in excluding in our minds the names of the great churchmen of the eleventh century from the list of true and zealous disciples of our common Master. Amid the corruptions which heresy has ever laboured to introduce, they clung to the great outlines of apostolic doctrine as set forth in the creeds; and it is therefore, under Heaven, to them, in common with the representatives of the Church before and after them, that we owe the possession of these all-important symbols in this our later day.

But the subject which we at present wish to consider is rather the character of the work itself than that of the workmen by whom the structure of papal dominion was consolidated. The materials of that dominion had been, from the earliest age of Christianity, preparing. From the first, and amid the deep and general reverence for Episcopacy which pervaded the primitive times, special honours were attributed to those thrones in which Apostles themselves had sat, and to churches which they had directly benefited by their teaching, or adorned by their exploits or their sufferings. And to such honours Rome had unquestionably a special claim. "How happy," says Tertullian, who states the above fact, "how happy is that Church where Apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood—where Peter was likened in suffering to his Lord; where Paul was crowned with the martyrdom of John the Baptist; and whence John the Apostle, having been plunged without injury into boiling oil, was exiled to his island."* And as Rome was, in historical honours like these, unrivalled by any other city of the Latin Church, the course of events, in separating the Western and the Eastern world from each other, left her prelate standing in this respect single in rank among his fellow-bishops. The political supremacy, too, of Rome, in the first ages of Christianity, tended to establish, on two grounds, the privilege of primacy in her bishop; first, on account of the rule ever observed by the Church, of assimilating her geographical arrangements to those of the civil world around her; and secondly, because when missionaries were required for the establishment of churches in the newly Christianized portions of the empire, it was from the metropolis of that empire that they would naturally receive their orders and their authority. While, therefore, the frame-work of the Roman empire hung together, the bishops scattered through the various outlying countries of the west, stood, with reference to him who filled the chair of St. Peter, in a position very analogous to that

* Tertullian, *De Præscr. Hæret.* c. 36.

now occupied by our colonial prelates in relation to the successor of our English Austin. And though, by the breaking up of that colossal machine, this relative position underwent, in one respect, considerable alteration, yet the parental rights, so to speak, of the See of Rome, were unaffected by the change. The city of the Cæsars might cease to be the mistress, but that of St. Peter could not cease to be, in matters ecclesiastical, the mother of the West.

We find, accordingly, that though the territorial empire of Rome had, in the eighth century, been long resolved into its constituent elements, the idea of the general authority of her bishop was still so familiar to the minds of men as to induce a Frankish prince, Pepin, to seek in that authority a plea for the deposition of his Merovingian master, Childeric, and a sanction for his own intrusion into the vacant throne. This sanction was given by Pope Zachary, in 752, and his successor, Stephen II., solemnly placed, at St. Denis, in July, 754, the crown upon the head of the aspiring chieftain and upon those of his two sons. But in the year 800 the alliance between this, the Carlovingian, race of Frankish monarchs, and the See of St. Peter, was yet more closely cemented. On the Christmas-day of that year, Charlemagne, having in great measure re-embodied in his own the extinct empire of the West, received, at Rome, the imperial crown from the hands of Leo. III.; thus ratifying and illustrating the theory of Papal primacy to the world, in the most striking manner. Thenceforward, the cause of that primacy became virtually that of the Carlovingian dynasty itself; and the descendants, accordingly, of Charlemagne, however various the positions which they at different times individually occupied with relation to the Pontiffs, were, and must needs have been, on the whole, and by system, the friends and supporters of the Vatican. In honouring, indeed, the Popes, the Carlovingians were honouring the origin and support of their own power; it need not, therefore, surprise us to read that Louis II., one of this race, who had condescended to appear as a spectator at the inauguration of Pope Nicholas I. to his sacred office, should, as the Pope approached on horseback to visit him, leap from his own horse, and lead that of the Pontiff for the distance of a bow-shot. But the most important act of outward homage paid by these princes to the Papal prerogative was the repetition, in the persons of many of them, of the august ceremony of a Roman coronation. This taught the world to realize, if we may so say, the theory that the Church, as represented by her head, the successor to St. Peter, was the great disposer, under heaven, of regal honours and of earthly power. And so completely was this theory admitted by the Carlovingian monarchs themselves, that

we find the emperor already named, Louis II., ascribing, in a letter addressed, in 871, to the Grecian monarch, Basilus the Macedonian, his elevation to the dignity which he enjoyed, under heaven, to the imposition of pontifical hands. "Uctione," he says, "et sacratione per summi Pontificis manus impositionem divinitus sumus ad hoc culmen provecti."

But the empire of the Carlovings passed away. Charles le Gros, the last sovereign of their house, was, in 887, contemptuously expelled the throne. And the imperial title itself, for some time longer the prize of those warlike princes who could successively obtain a pre-eminence over their rivals, and the consequent honours of a Roman coronation, fell, on the death of Berengarius in 924, into disuse: the nations of the West resuming the character of unconnected principalities or kingdoms. Several causes, however, concurred to prevent the ecclesiastical empire, if so we may call it, of the Popes, from sharing in the fall of that founded by their secular sovereigns. Toward the middle of the ninth century—about the precise period in which the effect of Charlemagne's sanction to the papal pretensions would be most decidedly felt—a collection of decretals, in many respects spurious, saw the light. It contained a number of letters and decrees, professedly emanating from the Bishops of Rome from the very foundation of the See of St. Peter downwards: but many of them—those which gave to the collection its peculiar importance,—were, it is probable, either forged or first published by a deacon of Mentz, in the century just named; though the collection was accredited to the world by the name of Isidore of Seville. Throughout the whole, though a reverence for the episcopal order in general was systematically inculcated, the papal powers and prerogatives were, above all, insisted upon. All privileges which the Roman prelates had claimed or could claim on the grounds already suggested, were, according to the documents now brought forth, no more than had been claimed and exercised by their predecessors from the apostolic age itself. The shadowy theory of their universal and heaven-derived dominion over the Church acquired form and substance; and, supported in appearance by precedents of incontrovertible authority, was brought forward into open day to challenge the reverence and the submission of mankind.

And yet, singularly as their path to systematic empire over the Church was smoothed by this series of forgeries, the Popes themselves appear to have been by no means instrumental in its fabrication. As has been already intimated, the researches of the learned have led them to trace its origin, or at least its promulgation, to a German city far removed from the immediate controul

of the Vatican. And though the Popes were not, of course, slow to appeal to the authority of documents so favourable to the views which circumstances had led them to entertain; yet it was to that authority, as comparatively established, that they did so; and not, as far as appears, with any direct view of establishing it. Nicholas I. was, we believe, the first Pontiff by whom (in 865) the spurious collection was expressly cited; and his citation was made for the purpose of enforcing inferences drawn from their contents upon those by whom their authenticity must be supposed to have been admitted. And eight years before this pontifical appeal to them, a Frankish monarch, Charles the Bald, had quoted them with a similar intention.

The fact is, prominently as the papal prerogatives were put forward in these decretals, it does not seem that the exaltation of those prerogatives was either the object with which the spurious parts of the collection were composed, or the main design of most of those whose reception of them clothed them with authority. The morals of the age, of the clergy as well as of the laity of the period, had become, through a variety of causes, lax and unsettled. And to the growing laxity of the former class, the apostolical constitution of the Church, the gradation of its orders, and the authority of its bishops, interposed a standing impediment. Participators as many prelates might be, and were, in the corruptions of the time, the machinery of episcopal government, as far as the clergy were concerned, still worked, on the whole, with tolerable freedom; and fulfilled, in a corresponding degree, the high purposes for which it had been constructed. The majority, it may be, of the Church's rulers was careless or worldly, but of those who would act with principle and energy the hands were unfettered; and, not to speak of the influence necessarily exerted even by one such bishop over the conduct of his brethren, the impunity of licentiousness or disorder among the lower ranks of the clergy was at best dependent in every case on the continuance of a vicious or indulgent prelate in his see. That such impunity should be held by a firmer tenure was the too natural wish of many; and such an end could by no other means be so readily attained as by the degradation of the episcopal order itself.

Kings, in the civil world, had risen to pre-eminence by the depression of those with whom they had formerly stood on the same level as members of an aristocracy. The whole political system of the world, in the century of Charlemagne, familiarized men's minds to the idea of one head presiding over a variety of chieftains, armed in their own respective districts with power of the same nature with his own. And reasons, in some measure

analogous to those which in subsequent times taught the commonalties of Europe to seek in the increasing power of the throne a refuge from the more galling, because more immediate, tyranny of haughty nobles, tended, in the age of which we are speaking, to turn the eyes of the discontented clergy of the West toward a power which, too distant to exercise itself over their conduct an effectual controul, might yet be most efficient to balance, and consequently to weaken, the much more dreaded authority of their immediate diocesans. Did the compiler of the decretals of Isidore indeed entertain views like these, he could unquestionably have forwarded them in no more effectual way than by establishing it, as he attempted to do, upon canonical authority, that bishops were in every department of their administration subject to the papal controul; that no national or provincial synods could be held without the Pope's consent or approval; that his apostolic throne formed a standing court of appeal from the decisions of his brother prelates; and that all causes of greater intricacy than usual should of right be referred to his own immediate jurisdiction.

Those who thus attempted the transference of ecclesiastical power from the episcopal order in general to one king-like prelate, were materially aided in the accomplishment of their design by the influence of a body then of considerable and widely diffused importance in the Church. We allude to the members of the monastic orders, who appear in the strife between episcopal aristocracy and pontifical monarchy to have played a part very analogous to that of the municipal corporations in the contentions between the kings of Europe and their feudal nobles. All institutions of man have some besetting evil tendency or other; and that of religious societies—even when free in their original constitution from the taint of a violation of Church discipline—is, unquestionably, to throw that discipline into the shade; as though the bonds of union thus humanly contrived obscured in men's minds the idea of that more sacred union—our fellowship with each other as members of the one Church—which heaven has appointed for us. And as such evil tendencies are sure, in the long run, to be worked out and to show themselves, it need not surprise us to find that, at the time of which we treat, a jealousy of episcopal interference habitually pervaded the monastery. And a close connection between the conventual houses and the Pope was found the most secure method of setting the legitimate power of the diocesans at defiance. A vast and influential band of men, therefore, throughout Europe, were ready alike to hail the favourable circumstances by which the idea of papal empire over the Church was familiarized to the

world, and to approve of the enunciation of that idea as formally systematized and set forth in the decretals of Isidore.

And as the system of Romish ecclesiastical monarchy, thus supported, gradually acquired consistency and form, further sanction to it would be given by many even of the best-intentioned of those in opposition to whose legitimate powers its fabric was reared. It is for the truly Catholic in spirit, and for them alone, to feel in its full force the obligation of maintaining, in matters of Church discipline, a line of conduct based upon principles of permanent and universal utility to the Church, in opposition to the courses which the welfare of their own immediate generation, were they permitted to look to that alone, might suggest. The weaker in faith will ever succumb to the temptation of giving up what they deem the unnecessary niceties of ecclesiastical regulation for the sake of what they conceive the instant and manifest advantage of religion. And to many well-meaning prelates of the time of which we are treating, the tacit surrender of their rights would appear—what, for the moment, in fact, it would be—the readiest mode of securing to themselves the power necessary for the continued discharge of their pastoral duties. In no age of the world, it is probable, could any national branch of the Church Catholic continue long in a state of isolation from the rest of that body and yet preserve its strength and its purity. And in the middle ages, from the comparative paucity of the means of inter-national communication, the Churches of the different kingdoms of the West would, but for the working of some cause singularly and permanently efficient in maintaining their union, have become in effect so many different institutions, each continually modified in character by the genius of the nation with which it was connected, and each exposed, in a rude and violent age, to the insults and oppressions of the secular power; without the possibility of external aid, and without what perhaps was still more efficacious, the moral force derived to it, from the recognition by mankind of its Catholic character. While at the same time, the original intimacy of Christian union throughout the world having ceased to exist, the degradation of branches of the one institution of our Lord into national establishments being already a closely impending evil, we can imagine no engine more likely to be promptly efficacious in restoring to a certain point the interrupted communication, and in supporting each individual branch of the Church by generalizing the respective energies of all, than that which was in fact resorted to; the conversion, so to call it, of the ecclesiastical world into a monarchy. And the idea of such a monarchy had no sooner

been acted upon—the kingly throne of St. Peter had no sooner been, even partially, reared, than its importance, on grounds like these, would be practically manifested. From the haughtiness and licentiousness of irreligious kings and nobles, they, who would otherwise have been the cowed and persecuted pastors of unprotected churches, had thenceforth a court of appeal ever ready and ever disposed, alike by principle and by interest, to maintain their cause. The Roman Patriarch, if permitted to concentrate in himself their spiritual power, could speak, when occasion required it, with the collective voice of all the Churches of the West. The force of the whole Latin ecclesiastical community became consequently disposable, and applicable in its fulness as the antagonist of every partial, we might even say, of every individual assault or corruption. The Church, as she then stood, became apparently stronger, even by the weakening of her appointed pillars. And bishops, the path of whose immediate duty seemed to be made smooth before them by their acquiescence in a system productive of such results, should not, surely, be harshly judged by us, if, thus tempted, they forgot the duty of clinging at all times to the rock upon which the Church is by divine appointment based—the unchanged, the unshaken rock of the apostolical succession and polity.

With our imperfect knowledge of the times, the fact commonly escapes us, that the supremacy of the Pope, as far as the Church herself was concerned, arose not so much from his absolute exaltation, as from the relative importance derived to him from the positive depression of the episcopal order in general. We are apt to identify the principles of his power with what we commonly style high-church principles pushed to their extreme—to regard his autocracy as a sort of exaggerated development of the episcopal polity. Whereas, in truth, it was upon the ruins of that polity;—it was in opposition to it, and upon the general degradation of the prelacy of Western Europe, that was based the usurping throne of pontifical supremacy. The titles with which the Popes arrayed themselves in the plenitude of their power—"Summus Sacerdos"—"Pontifex Maximus"—"Vicarius Christi"—"Papa" itself, were, nearer to the primitive times, the honourable appellation of every bishop;—as "sedes apostolica" was that of the site of every bishop's throne. The ascription of these titles, therefore, to the Pope, only gave to the terms a new force, because that ascription became exclusive; because, that is, the bishops in general were stripped of honours to which their claims were as well founded as those of their Roman brother; who became by the change not so strictly "universal"

as "sole" bishop.* The episcopal body retired, as it were, in his favour from the high prerogatives with which it was collectively invested; led, for the above reasons, to acquiesce in a system tending to degrade those who held their spiritual powers immediately—or as the legal phrase is, *in capite*—of the great Head of the Church in Heaven, into mesne or subordinate tenants of those powers, under the universal tenancy in chief of the Romish Prelate. At the Council of Trent,—that ill-omened assembly, by which so many prevalent errors of Popery were incorporated into articles of faith—an attempt was indirectly made to give to this popish heresy among others an official sanction, and to establish by implication the point that the bishops of Christ's universal Church owed their jurisdiction, if not their order, to the pontifical appointment alone. This attempt, thanks to the determined resistance of the Spanish prelates who attended the council, proved abortive; but the fact of its having been made shows the tendency of the papal system, and the feelings of its abettors toward the apostolical discipline and order.†

The working of that system, when the authority of the decretals first became available to its systematic consolidation, was entrusted to able and energetic hands. Nicholas I., already cited as having been the first among the Pontiffs to quote the supposititious collection of Isidore, wielded the powers which the documents therein contained concurred with the popular opinion of his day in ascribing to him, with no vacillating policy. By the threat of excommunication, he compelled Lothair, King of the province since named from him Lotharingia or Lorrain, to put away Waldrada, whom he had disreputably married, and to receive again his injured and repudiated wife, Theutberga. In a synod at Rome he deposed, in 863, Thietgaud and Gunthar, the Archbishops respectively of Treves and Cologne. He compelled,

* "*Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Episcopus*," a style frequently adopted by the Pontiffs in the plenitude of their power—by Pius IV., for instance, in decrees relative to the Council of Trent—was, therefore, an accurate statement of their pretensions.

† The exaltation of the Roman Bishop was resisted, as involving the general degradation of his order, by one not likely to have entertained unreasonable or exaggerated ideas of the evils likely to result from that exaltation—Pope Gregory the Great. "I am," he said in an epistle to the Patriarch of Alexandria, "but a brother of the order. . . . Nor do I reckon that an honour to myself which is paid me at the expense and prejudice of my brethren. My reputation lies in the honour of the universal Church and in preserving the dignity of the rest of the prelates. . . . Now if your Holiness" (he thus styled the Patriarch) "treats me with the title of Universal Bishop, you exclude yourself from an equality of privilege." And at a much more mature point of the growth of papal pretension—in the eleventh century itself—we find Leo IX. declaring in his epistle to the Grecian Patriarch, Michael, that his predecessor and namesake, to whom the title of Œcumenical Patriarch was offered by the Council of Chalcedon, "*superbum refutavit vocabulum penitus, quo videbatur par dignitas subtrahi cunctis per orbem præsulibus, dum uni ex toto arrogaretur.*"

on the other hand, Hincmar, the sagacious and powerful Archbishop of Rheims, even though that prelate denied the authority of the decretals, to restore certain persons to their clerical stations whom he had deposed as uncanonically ordained, and to re-establish in his diocese, Rothad, Bishop of Soissons, who had appealed to Rome against the decree of the archbishop and his synod, which deprived him of it. And the prerogatives of Nicholas, during these transactions, were so fully admitted by his contemporary, the Emperor Louis, that when an Archbishop of Ravenna, who was at variance with the Pontiff, appealed to that prince, at Pavia, for his support in the quarrel, Louis bade him lay aside his pride, and humble himself before that great Pope "before whom," said he, "we and the whole Church bow, and to whom we show all duty and obedience." While the people of the town—so thoroughly was the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy over all other ecclesiastics received into the popular creed—shrunk not only from receiving the suppliant archbishop into their houses, but even from holding, in the way of buying or selling, any intercourse with his attendants.

Thus consolidated and established in the minds of men, the papal monarchy, as we have already intimated, survived the dissolution of the Carolingian empire, even though qualities like those of Nicholas I. were but rarely to be found among his successors. In one light, indeed, the extinction of the Imperial name and power might be regarded as favourable to the prerogatives of these spiritual sovereigns; inasmuch as it taught mankind to view them as standing apart from, and unconnected with, the shifting constitutions and varying fortunes of secular monarchies. The independent existence, even of the Pontiff's unauthorized dominion, illustrated the reality of that heaven-derived authority which he usurpingly presumed to wield. And he who could meet the Emperors of the West on the footing rather of superiority than equality, was left, on their disappearance from the world, on a throne unapproached in dignity by that of any of the comparatively petty sovereigns who divided among themselves the territories of the empire.

That such dignity, howsoever acquired, would in the long run be abused by its possessors, might as certainly have been predicted as the tyrannies of monarchs yet unchosen could be described by the prophet Samuel, when in a time strikingly parallel to that which we are considering,* the Israelites strove to convert their theocracy into a constitution more nearly resembling that of earthly monarchies.

* Vide Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, vol. ii. serm. 21.

A seat so exalted as that of St. Peter now became would of course be often the prize of unworthy occupants; whose conduct when they had succeeded in grasping the crozier would but too well accord with the views with which they had sought it, and with the means by which they had attained it. Power, kingly in its nature, would, in the hands of persons like these, naturally surround itself with the externals of kingly luxury and magnificence; and of the manners of the earlier successors to the Apostles few traces would be found amid the profusion of a palace and the dissoluteness of a court.

The middle of the tenth century, therefore, presents us with a new phase in the papal history. Italy, long plunged in anarchy, required that repose which could only be enjoyed under the government of an energetic and powerful monarch; and Otho, the German sovereign, invited across the Alps to assume the crown of her kings, received also, in 962, the imperial diadem from the hands of Pope John XII., thus partially reconstructing the empire of Charlemagne. But this prince and his successors were led by circumstances to play toward the Roman church a part very different from that of the founder of the Carlovingian imperial line.

Viewed as a whole, the ecclesiastical monarchy still, at the period of Otho's coronation, existed in vigour. The workings of the system were daily and hourly felt throughout the West. And yet while distant regions tremblingly acknowledged and obeyed the power of the Vatican, that power had become, through the vices of its holders, contemptible at home. The profligate John XII. had been consecrated at the age of eighteen, and for purposes strictly and avowedly secular, to his sacred office. His demeanour as head of the Roman church was such as might be expected from a beginning like this; and Otho, though invited by himself across the Alps, was soon regarded by him as a strict preceptor, whose presence was irksome as imposing a check upon his irregularities. The pontiff first intrigued, then rebelled, against his sovereign; and the emperor, who showed toward him, as long as it was possible, the consideration of a kind-hearted man for a wilful boy, was at last induced to drive him from the seat which he disgraced, and to instal thereon in a hasty and rather uncanonical manner John's secretary, Leo VIII. And the headstrong conduct of John was the cause of yet further humiliation to the papacy. He contrived on Otho's departure from Rome to reinstate himself in his see: while Leo, forced, in his turn, to fly, took refuge in the camp of his imperial patron. And though the profligate pontiff did not himself long enjoy his triumph, as his intemperance, if not a wound received in the prosecution of his intrigues, put an end to his life on the 14th of

May, 964; yet the Romans, to whom the pope imposed on them was odious, elected upon his decease, and in defiance of the imperial will, a cardinal deacon of their church; who assumed the name of Benedict V., and whose election the papal writers still regard as legitimate. Upon which the incensed emperor, entering the city in arms, and having caused this object of their choice to be brought before him, compelled him to divest himself of his robe of state and to deliver his crozier into the hands of Leo, by whose command it was instantly broken into pieces. The successor of Leo, John XIII. (appointed in 965,) was also a virtual nominee of the emperor; whose representatives, the Bishops of Spire and Cremona, attended to sanction the ceremony of his consecration; and whose arms were, in 966, again needed to protect the successor to St. Peter against the unruly nobles and populace of Rome.

It thus appears that Otho, though he, like Charlemagne, accepted the imperial crown in the first instance from the papal hand, was yet far from exhibiting himself to the world, as that monarch had done, as the dutiful son and servant of the Church. Equally well intentioned, it may be, towards her, he was led by circumstances to take upon him the very opposite character of her patron and superior; defending her against her enemies, but asserting over her the right of controul to which this defence of her appeared naturally to entitle him. Through his administration the Church, as represented by her supposed head, became in great measure the vassal of the sovereign; and the more so because the hostility which, in consequence of this their known dependence, the Popes experienced from their Roman subjects, drove them perpetually to cling more and more closely to the protecting arm of the imperial power. And to this, unquestionably, among other causes, must be ascribed the fact that the century which followed Otho's assumption of the title of Charlemagne saw the see of St. Peter, with the exception of some brief intervals, the scene of ever-increasing moral degradation. This painful spectacle reached its climax in the reign of an Emperor of the following, or Franconian, dynasty, Henry III.; when the world beheld in the papal city three worthless claimants of the pontifical dignity—each alike unfit to bear it—contending for superiority: one occupying the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore—one the Lateran—and the third St. Peter's. The scandal of such a state of things was too glaring to permit of its continuance. Henry III. led, in 1046, his army toward Rome: then halting at Sutri, a few miles north of the city, he summoned the rivals before him. One, entertaining some hopes of a decision in his favour, obeyed the summons. But Henry and the bishops, who were his assessors, gave their sentence

against all:—the monarch then selected a German bishop of his train for the vacant pontificate, and installed him as Clement II., receiving himself, on the same day, the imperial crown from his hand. And then, in conjunction with the pontiff thus chosen, Henry laboured zealously, and, as far as the immediate crisis was concerned, successfully, in the work of purifying the Church. Simony, the disgraceful system of making spiritual offices the subjects of bargain and sale, was the object of his most determined hostility. That system, ever rising anew into vigour as the spiritual—or in other words the true—notion of the Church's essence and character fades from the minds of men, had at the epoch of the council of Sutri, fearfully contaminated Western Europe. And it was, undoubtedly, with the honest view of counteracting this and other evils that Henry was led to take the whole power of the Church, in a manner, into his own hands. From the Roman authorities, who had unquestionably shown themselves, in many instances, unfit to conduct so important a business as the election of a head of the Western Church, he exacted an oath that such elections should thenceforward be carried on under the imperial auspices alone: assuming, in effect, the power of nomination to himself. And this proceeding may well represent—as far as the Church was concerned—the general tenor of his conduct. He strove to reform her, and in a great measure, as far as her more visible evils were concerned, succeeded. But it was in the spirit of a king, rather than of a churchman, that his reforms were carried on. He looked more to the immediate, than to the eventual, working of his amendments; more to the eradication of existing and palpable blemishes than to the preservation, or rather renovation, of that system in which alone a permanent corrective of these and other such incidental evils could be found. Purifying the Church, he enslaved her,—thus subjecting her, in return for a temporary benefit, to a lasting evil. His personal good qualities, on which the benefit depended for its continuance, could not, in the nature of things, descend to every inheritor of his throne; while the ecclesiastical autocracy which he had acquired would as naturally, supposing no fresh moral revolution to occur, have descended in increased vigour, to each succeeding generation. And the evils thus menacing in theory soon showed themselves formidable in practice. On Henry's death in 1056, the imperial sceptre was at first weakly swayed by his widow, the empress regent Agnes, and then by her dissolute and ill-educated son Henry IV. The advantages which the Church had derived from the energy and integrity of the deceased monarch's character vanished with himself from the scene. His reforming policy was thought of no more; and

the power of which, for the purpose of reformation, he had possessed himself, was employed with intentions the most opposite. The imperial cabinet allied itself with, and represented, the low, or lax, party in the Church. Those very abuses which the late monarch had sought the most honestly to eradicate were patronized by—and we might almost say incorporated into the system of—his successor. Irreligion, or at least worldliness, in the church was supported by the whole weight of the imperial power. And considering how completely the Latin Church had, as we have seen, concentrated her authority in the Papacy, and that now that Papacy itself seemed doomed to become the powerless vassal of the state and the creature of an arbitrary monarch's will, we are not, perhaps, asserting too much in saying that never was the Christian church in so fearful a strait before. An evil infinitely more alarming than her early persecutions and difficulties threatened—humanly speaking—irrevocably to overwhelm her. Her proper guardians had surrendered their rights into the hands of the Roman prelate. And the emperor, by rendering the latter a mere puppet in his hands, must have concentrated in himself, unchecked as he would be by the restraints imposed by ecclesiastical discipline and by the priestly character, the whole of the sacerdotal power of the West. Simony, partially checked by the individual efforts of Henry III., now, as this unnatural system approached its realization, flourished anew and extended itself more widely than ever. Bishoprics, abbeys, and benefices became throughout the empire the subjects of open and unblushing competition by purchase; and the highest bidders for them, receiving investiture from the monarch with forms nearly similar to those by which his lay vassals received their fiefs, were regarded as little differing in position from the other feudatories of his crown. Throughout the West, the sacerdotal was tending to merge itself in the secular character. The morals of the clergy, high and low, were in a state of systematic declension; and though their marriages had long been proscribed by canons to which—whatever we may now think of them—they stood pledged to obedience, they not only habitually slighted this injunction, but abandoned themselves too frequently to irregularities unworthy of the name, we will not say of a priest, but of a Christian; being little if at all distinguishable in point of purity from the gross and profligate laity who surrounded them. Had this state of things continued, or rather had it, as it must in the ordinary course of things soon have done, more fully developed itself, the spiritual character of the Christian religion and of the Christian church must have altogether disappeared from the dimmed eyes of men. And the outward form of the ecclesiastical polity, if yet pre-

served, would have stood but as a component part of the system of the empire,—as a machine to be worked, as the heathen religions had been, by the hands of the civil magistrate,—as one element, not more revered or more durable than the others, in the ever-varied and heterogeneous composition of the feudal constitution of Europe.

But a consummation so fearful was, by what we can scarcely forbear to call a marvellous Providence, averted. As the antagonist of this menacing system, the Papacy, which had during the latter years of Henry III. and the minority of his successor, Henry IV., silently snapped several of the chains which bound it in vassalage to the state, suddenly arose in renewed power. The extent of the existing moral evil had in some measure wrought out itself the means of its counteraction. A school of divines, the most conspicuous of whom was the celebrated Hildebrand, had arisen in Rome as the advocates of stricter and purer views in morals and discipline than generally prevailed; and these, having acted in concert with Henry III. in his warfare against simony and impurity, continued their efforts independently after his decease, with the impetus which he had, to a certain extent, assisted in giving. The party of these reformers strengthened itself by its own working. The ascetic purity of its leaders commanded the veneration of mankind, and stood out in bright contrast with the dissoluteness, the corruption, the worldly-mindedness, of that party in the Church which, when the imperial influence came to be arrayed against them, clung to its side; and thus was gradually brought into play a conservative principle capable of coping with and, as the event proved, of withstanding and overmastering the unspiritualizing system, which nothing but such resistance could, it is probable, have prevented from overshadowing the whole Christian, or at any rate the whole Western, world.

The details of the crisis in which the two opposite systems came into collision, and in which, by an unexampled moral revolution, the imperial was crushed before the pontifical power, can scarcely be done justice to within the limits of this article. These, and the character of the principal actor in the eventful drama, Hildebrand, we may probably consider on a future occasion. Suffice it now to say, that of that crisis, happening as it did, the occurrence cannot fairly be ascribed to this or that particular act alone of either party. One event led to another, and the last decisive measure, the excommunication and deposition of Henry IV. by the Pontiff in the council at Rome, was but the reply of the Vatican to the excommunication and deposition of its chief, in the most irregular manner, and upon charges the most

absurd and unfounded, by an imperial assembly at Worms. But public opinion, or rather, to use a higher term, public principle, adopted, and gave weight to, the dictum of the Roman assembly alone; and the emperor, gradually deserted by all, was necessitated at length to cross the Alps in the depth of winter, and then to stand barefoot for three successive days in the castle court of Canossa, a suppliant for absolution and restoration to his throne. And from this epoch commenced, in effect, that full dominion of the Papacy, to which all the previous events which we have described had been tending as to a natural conclusion, and which, though commonly regarded among us as fraught with evil alone, should, we think, be looked upon rather in the light of a mysterious dispensation of Providence, in which good and evil were strangely blended. If we look at it in contrast with the government of the Church in the days of her primitive and apostolic purity, it unquestionably presents the appearance of a system of fearful corruption. But if we view it as opposed to the system which, as its contemporary, did in truth oppose it—the system of a general secularization of the Church's polity—it can, whether we consider it with a view to its effect on ecclesiastical discipline, or on the general morals of mankind, be scarcely regarded otherwise than as a blessing. Its theory, lamentably removed in the abstract from that apostolical scheme by which the Church was originally governed, was yet a near approach to that scheme as compared with the irregular and unauthorized domination which it interrupted and succeeded. At the time of its establishment it was, in short, a reformation. It was brought about by the strict, the high party in the Church, in opposition to the efforts of the worldly and the low. It may be contemplated, under a variety of aspects, as the triumph of strictness over impurity, of faith over unbelief, of order over insubordination. And its immediate result was unquestionably manifested in an amendment of manners alike among the clergy and the laity, in an increase of salutary vigour in the discipline of the Church, and in the growth of a deep spirit of popular reverence for the high mysteries of religion.

It may have been observed by our readers, that in tracing, as we have done, the progress of this extraordinary empire, we have said nothing of the doctrinal corruptions with which, according to the current opinion, that progress is to be viewed as essentially connected. This opinion we imagine to arise from that universal, because natural, error in reasoning alluded to at the outset of these remarks: those who have not leisure or inclination to investigate the subject, find it convenient to view the doctrines of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Image-worship, and the like, as though incorporated with each other, and with the papal domi-

nion, in an essential unity; the Popes being regarded as having been in their official, and, so to say, inherent character, the prime movers in, and principal upholders of, these varied heresies and their dependent errors. Whereas the fact is, that for the origin of most of these abuses the Pontiffs are not in any degree responsible; nor was even their subsequent growth fostered by them in any peculiar, or, if we may use the expression, personal way. The autocratic heads of the Church were of necessity in some measure the representatives and organs of her general feeling; and the papal name has on this account become connected with many pernicious doctrines, which had neither originated in the policy, nor (at least until universally prevalent) been supported by the power of the Vatican.

The doctrine of Purgatory, for instance, whatever hints on the subject might have been given by earlier Fathers, seems first to have assumed a tangible shape in the writings of the celebrated Bishop of Hippo. That of Transubstantiation was moulded by Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corbie. Image-worship was adopted from the East. And so far, in the great struggle which preceded the full triumph of the Papacy, was the establishment of these heresies from being associated with the triumph of the Vatican, that a disbelief, or at least a dubious belief, in Transubstantiation, was one of the charges currently brought against Hildebrand by the imperial party, and one of the grounds upon which they attempted to justify the unwarranted sentence against him pronounced by the conciliabule of Worms.

That there existed a sort of mysterious sympathy between the system of errors which, collectively taken, we may style doctrinal Popery, and the elevation of the Roman Patriarch's throne, we will not deny. But it is, perhaps, a more correct view of this connection to regard the two as derived from one common source, than to conceive of the one as having been directly instrumental in the production of the other. As the temper of the times waxed gross, as the vision of spiritual religion faded before men's eyes, both Christianity and the Christian Church became, if the expression may be allowed, materialized; and the conversion of the unearthly system of the apostolic polity into a more worldly, a more tangible, scheme of monarchy, was the fruit of precisely the same mental habits and modes of thought as those which moulded a reverential and mysterious feeling toward the saints departed into an open adoration, and which degraded the holy mystery of the Eucharist into the palpable and more intelligible miracle of Transubstantiation.

Nor that an interested, or, to speak plainly, a corrupt use was made of these doctrinal errors, when once established, by the

successors of St. Peter; are we prepared to dispute. But this fact would be more properly cited were we tracing the effects of the false position to which they were elevated in the minds of the Pontiffs, than in an inquiry into the causes by which that position was attained. At the moment of the great struggle in which the Papacy rose to pre-eminence, they and the assertors of their cause participated in the doctrinal corruptions which so generally overspread the world around them; but it was not, generally speaking, either for these corruptions that they fought, or through them that they conquered. Clerical celibacy, indeed, they made subservient to their views; but that system, erroneous as we now conceive it, had, long before the struggle in question commenced, been incorporated into the received code of Christian purity; and we shall have a very faulty view of the question in relation to it, which was really at issue between the Papalists and the Imperialists of the eleventh century, unless we perceive, in the opposition of the latter to the enforcement of this already recognized canon, much of that spirit of hostility to order, to authority, and to strictness of manners, in which, through all ages, the Church and her rulers have found their most persevering antagonist. It will not follow, therefore, that the Popes, in adhering in this respect to established authority, were wrong as against the party of the Emperors, even though we may admit them to have been, in this instance, wrong in the abstract. But the truth is, that this prohibition of the Church was itself but another type of the prevailing mode of thought, and instance of its operation. We are accustomed, after reading St. Paul's sentiments on the subject of celibacy in general, to dismiss them at once from our minds, as though they applied exclusively to the circumstances of the Church in the apostolic age. The Church, in times immediately following that age, unquestionably thought otherwise; and from the high and mysterious impressions of early Christians on the subject, the positive prohibition of clerical marriage might naturally result by a simplifying and unspiritualizing process analogous to that already alluded to, by which a reverence for the dead was converted into an idolatry, and the tenet of the real presence into the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

It was not, then, as the corrupters of religion that the Popes rose to the occupation of the loftiest throne in Europe. Yet that their progress to such power was unaccompanied, necessarily and inherently, by fearful guilt, we cannot affirm; not that we would make that guilt to consist, as many would, in the assumption by a spiritual dignitary of temporal power; for the distinction between spiritual power and temporal is not quite so broad and clear to our eyes as it would appear to be to those of some

among our contemporaries. If by temporal power, as opposed to spiritual, be meant the power of physical force—the power which monarchs exercise through their armies, or through the knowledge of mankind that they are able, if necessary, to compel obedience by violent means—such temporal power the successors to St. Peter never either aspired to or possessed. They became, it is true, the actual sovereigns of a territory in Italy; but this fact is beside the main question. The strength of their universal empire lay ever in their controul over the minds, not over the bodies, of men. And though armies, in the palmy state of Papal Rome, were undoubtedly brought into the field, and kingdoms overthrown, through her agency, yet the temporal power exerted on these occasions was in strictness that of her vassals, not her own. The link of connection between herself and those who were the more direct agents in these operations, was simply the faith of mankind in the spiritual prerogatives of the successors of St. Peter. Her negotiations were pastoral letters; her arms, excommunications; her influence, even over her visible servants, depended on the belief of men in the unseen world.

Nor if by temporal power, when the Papacy is spoken of, be meant power applied to temporal purposes, does the charge become much clearer to our apprehension. It appears to us that every purpose, every end, is in one sense spiritual; and that to assert the contrary would be to maintain that religion was connected with but a portion, separated and set aside, of the daily business of life, the remaining parts of the great field of human enterprize and exertion being without the sphere of her legitimate influence. Whereas, believing as we do that Christianity is intimately connected with the whole system of social and political morality, we cannot clearly understand how it can be brought as a charge against any men, that they exerted its influence in matters of conduct to which it was irrelevant. The real guilt which stained the papal cause in its great struggle, and in its triumph, appears to us to have been but a further development, on the part of Rome, of the principle by which episcopacy had been previously debased before her spiritual autocracy. Having forgotten—as led by circumstances to forget—the reverence due to those who held by succession the apostolic power, the papal mind was by the natural course of things schooled into irreverence for another authority, toward which the Church, in the days of her purity, had ever felt a submissive deference to be a Christian duty—the authority, we mean, of the secular sovereign. Loyalty to the chief magistrate, and respect to the divinely commissioned governors of the Church, are, indeed, kindred virtues, or rather, strictly speaking, different types and illustrations of the same

moral habit; and they whose episcopal seat had been converted into a solitary throne by the depression of bishops, were, by an almost necessary consequence, regardless of the due prerogatives of kings. Hildebrand and his coadjutors disgraced the quarrel of the Church by sullyng it with the crime of rebellion against Cæsar,—by deposing from his royalties, as well as severing from the communion of the faithful, the profligate emperor to whom they were opposed,—by forgetting, in short, while enforcing what was in truth but due reverence for their own authority, the reverence due from them in return to the anointed wielders of the civil sword. Their secular usurpation, therefore, if so it should be styled, was, if the expression may be allowed, rather a negative than a positive one; it was, as in the case of the establishment of pontifical supremacy over the prelacy, wrought out more by the relative degradation of others, than by the positive exaltation of themselves. And by way of extenuating the conduct of the immediate agents in this anti-monarchical revolution, it may be remarked that the line thus adopted by them cannot in fairness be considered as having originated with themselves, inasmuch as it naturally resulted from that closeness of union between the Church and the state to which, certainly with no particular view to the interests of the former, the world had long before their time been accustomed by its rulers. This union having been thoroughly recognized by all,—it having been admitted by all that the ecclesiastical and civil authorities were connected with each other by the links of feudalism, the one holding, in the language of the times, its station of the other,—they are rather to be regarded as modifying a received false notion than as introducing a new error, when they asserted that, of the two, the State was to be considered as the feudatory or vassal of the Church, and not the Church of the State.

With this character, then, and under these circumstances it was, that the papal empire arose to supremacy in the West. And even observers who look not on its fortunes with that deep interest which churchmen must feel in the subject, but who contemplate it as a simple historical phenomenon, have been struck in various ways with the magnificent spectacle presented by its operation;—the spectacle, we mean, of a purely moral power curbing, by the bare expression of its will, the violence of martial monarchs in rude and licentious times,—of old unarmed men, backed by no other force of their own than the faith of mankind in the truth of revealed religion and in the authority of the Church of the Redeemer, acting—by system at least, however often they might have abused their authority—as the dispensers of justice, the protectors of the oppressed, and the avengers of iniquity, in

the face of all the kingly authority and military greatness of the world.

But churchmen who, unbiassed by prejudices, can give to the subject of papal dominion their serious attention, may be disposed to attribute to the elevation and continuance of that empire advantages of a higher nature than the mere physical results of such a state of things as this. The Papacy, with all its corruptions, was, to the Latin world, the representative and personification, so to call it, of the Church of the many ages during which it flourished; and the governing power of the Eastern Church, while it yet maintained its position as a rival, was in so many respects similarly circumstanced to it as to feel, as far as the establishment of principles was concerned, a necessary sympathy with its fortunes and its development. In those fortunes therefore, in the struggles and in the successes of the papal party, more was in truth at hazard than the spiritual ascendancy of the Vatican, or the universal monarchy of the successors of St. Peter. Christianity itself, disguised as it might be under a corrupt theology, and subjected to an unauthorized discipline, was in fact at stake in the conflict carried on by Rome against her secular or infidel enemies; and her success in the strife was, as far as human eyes can see, the only means by which the great truths of Revelation, and the blessings derivable from the authorized ministration of the Christian sacraments, could have been handed down to later times. Revealed religion must, it is probable, as accepted by mankind, be in some degree debased in every age by the low moral tone of those to whom it is proffered, and to whose hands its teaching is confided. The human intellect, we may well suppose, cannot, even under the most favourable circumstances, grasp, as they really are, the great truths presented to it from above; our best and holiest endeavours to grasp them are but approximations; and even the sublime propositions which, upon indisputable authority, we embody in our creeds, true as they are in themselves, and false and impious as would be consequently the denial of them, must be supposed, from the imperfection of our faculties, and from the depravation of our moral nature, to furnish us rather with types and adumbrations of truth than with truth divine itself. Our knowledge, we mean to say, of Christianity, must at best be knowledge in a degree; the purer our minds, the holier our lives, the more we shall know. But we have inspired authority for saying that here we can know but in part. The witnesses for the truth in the purest times of the Church—leaving of course the inspired guides of the apostolic age out of the question—must have all been in some degree defective in their comprehension of the truths of Revelation; and he, therefore, who, in times more generally cor-

rupt, should, with a proportionally corrupt theology, testify to the truth of religion in general, might be found, upon consideration, to occupy a position in essentials much more nearly resembling theirs than would at first sight be apprehended. It is of course necessary for the accuracy of this resemblance, that the theology which he should maintain should be opposed in his day by none purer; but that he should defend and represent views as high as those entertained by any portion of the Church in his age. But this condition was, as we have said, in the case of the Papacy, fulfilled: it was a witness for the truth, not against truth in greater comparative clearness, but against infidelity and error.

And such it long continued: the monarch who trembled at the thunders of the Vatican, and the ruffian who quaked at the sight of a barefooted friar, were alike reminded, by the sentiments of terror thus excited in their minds, that there was a world "beyond this visible diurnal sphere;" that there was an authority exceeding that which could be founded or supported by violence and arms. Minds with which the Christian Church, in her true spiritual garb, would probably never have come into beneficial contact, were, from the more tangible form which she during the middle ages assumed,—from her apparent identification with the palpable system of a powerful monarchy, made to feel her reality, and to do her reverence. And thus the kingly government, for so we may call it, to which the Church during these ages committed herself, though as unauthorized in its outset and in its principle as that of Saul, for which the chosen people of earlier days had rejected the Theocracy, might be suffered to become, in some respects, God's favoured instrument of good, as was unquestionably the throne of David, of Hezekiah, and of Josiah. And even if we were to admit that this good was all of a prospective kind,—that the corruption of Christianity during the period of papal predominance was such as to make its beneficial influence, as far as that long period was directly concerned, nugatory,—yet should we of these latter days owe some gratitude to the power which, while obscuring the great doctrines of the faith from its contemporaries, preserved them for our more favoured gaze. For though we may imagine and speculate upon many other conceivable ways by which Christianity might have been kept in reverence, and the Christian Church and ministry have been prolonged from the days of Hildebrand to those of Luther, it is unquestionably true that, as far as Western Europe was concerned, the dominion of the Papacy *was* the method chosen to effect these great ends in the councils of Providence: precisely as we may conceive the monarchical form of Israelitish government to have been, in the hands of that Providence which ordinarily works by

means, an instrument of ensuring the safety, and of preserving the nationality, of the chosen people, amidst the powerful and war-like monarchies which might otherwise, humanly speaking, have irrecoverably overwhelmed them. The religion of Rome, and of the churches subject to her influence, represented, and that exclusively, when the sixteenth century dawned upon the world, the Christianity of the West.

That the faith once delivered to the saints had, during the ages preceding this last epoch, gradually become obscured,—that the perfect fabric of sound doctrine had been throughout disfigured, and its true proportions concealed, by the unauthorized additions with which ignorance, error, and hypocrisy had encrusted it, is too melaucholy a truth. Beneficial as might—as, according to our notions, did—the system of Papal monarchy prove, as far as its immediate and temporary effects were concerned,—important as the part which it played as the conservator of Christianity must prove to the remotest ages, it contained unquestionably within its essence the seeds of deterioration and corruption. In the Pope's first step toward supremacy was involved the debasement, and consequently the enfeebling, of the scriptural guardians of the Church's ordinances, discipline, and faith—the members of the episcopal order; and in proportion as this had been done had the Church forfeited the tenure of that promised and heaven-protected perpetuity which was pledged to her only in connection with the preservation by her members of her Apostolical polity. As far as she had become un-episcopal she had become mortal: her gradual decay, therefore, under the overspreading shadow of the papal autocracy, is not to be traced, as though necessarily depending on them, to any succession of isolated events or accidents; it rather resulted from the fixed constitution of her adopted nature,—it formed, and did not interfere with, the new rule of her existence.

Happily, however, for the best interests of mankind, the framework of episcopal polity—the unviolated order of the ministerial succession—was, amid all the errors and all the crimes of papal Rome in the degenerate ages which preceded the Reformation, preserved for the dawning of a brighter day. The doctrine of that succession had, in truth, undergone a fate precisely analogous to—we should perhaps say, sympathetic with—that of the other great doctrines of the Christian Church. It had been obscured and degraded by the submission of the prelacy to the papal autocracy, precisely as Baptism had been by the ascription of the sacramental character to penance, and as the Eucharist had been by being explained away into Transubstantiation. But the reality, alike of the Church Catholic herself, and of these the

means of grace entrusted to her charge, was even by these corruptions preserved in the memories of men, and held up to their habitual reverence. And thus, when our English reformers at length arose, their work was wonderfully—or, we would rather say, providentially—simplified. They were not imperatively called on to build and to pull down at one and the same time. The fabric of truth on which they laboured was sound at bottom, and all that was required was the removal of its disfigurements to exhibit its great outlines in their pristine beauty. The refutation of the monarchical claims of the Roman Pontiff was calculated, naturally as it were, and without the necessity of any further process, to restore to its former prerogatives the episcopal order. The unsacramentizing—if the word may be allowed—of penance, would, to the thoughtful mind, at once reinvest the holy Sacrament of Regeneration with the fulness of its scriptural glory. And the exposure of the figment of Transubstantiation was calculated to leave in its purity for the veneration of mankind the high and mysterious doctrine of the Supper of the Lord.

We do not say that these happy results, or such as these, were in truth the immediate results of our Reformers' labours. In all changes in which human agents are concerned, human passions will mingle; human prejudices will arise; marring and confounding in some degree the highest attempts, and thwarting the purest intentions. The benefits which we have thus broadly described could, it is probable, be attained in their fulness, at any one given time, in theory alone. But an approximation to such a state of things our English Reformers did, at the Reformation, in truth and in reality, obtain. And as they themselves, by whom that great work was undertaken, may be said to have arisen out of the papal system—to have acquired in papal schools their rudimentary knowledge of the great doctrines which it was permitted to them to illustrate and to clear, as well as to have acquired from the fact of papal predominance their first impressions of the reality of the Christian Church, and of the reverence which was her due,—we may even now, reformed as we are, owe to the stand against secularity made by the Papacy of old, and to the influence consequently acquired by it, a deeper debt of gratitude than most of us have ever imagined, or than many among us would be at all disposed to defray. For if it be conceivable that, had the Pontiffs never risen to supremacy, Christianity would, at the opening of the sixteenth century, have been found in a purer state than that in which at that period it was actually found among us—it is equally conceivable, and, as it appears to us, more historically probable, that, but for their

sway, the very name of Christianity would have disappeared from Western Europe. The very next stage in the process of its secularization under the hands of the German Henries would have been its complete conversion into a state religion, its Church assuming the character of the heathen establishments of old, which were nearly powerless over the morals, and utterly uninfluential over the faith of mankind. And how long, this mutation having been accomplished, its nominal existence would have been continued in the world, is a matter purely problematical, and, we will add, unimportant.

From the date of the Council of Trent, as we have already said, a new era began. Even had no essential change taken place at that epoch in the tenets of the Romish Church herself, that Church would, by the single fact of the occurrence of the Reformation, have been placed in a position not only new, but in some respects even opposite to that which, antecedently to the council in question, she had occupied. When purer Churches, as those of England, Ireland, and Sweden, existed in the West—Churches with which she was in contact, and to which she assumed a permanent attitude of opposition,—the testimony which Rome, as against former opponents, had borne to the truth, would have become, even without intrinsic alteration, a testimony to falsehood,—the partial verity of her creed guiding to the whole truth in the first case, and from it in the second. But the case thus put is not that which actually occurred. By incorporating, at Trent, her prevalent errors into the essence of her faith, Rome underwent, at that important crisis, an absolute change of position in addition to this merely relative one; her Pontiff then officially identifying himself with the establishment, in opposition to purity of faith, and to the authority of legitimate ecclesiastical government, of a system of error, superstition, and usurpation.

In such a position the Papacy has, as far as its own internal character has been concerned, from that period remained. Nor of that position would we—durst we—become the apologists. Our quarrel with it, as it now is, is as deep as can be that of the most fiery champion among the ranks of Protestantism;—though, remembering the Apostle Jude's allusion to the words of Michael, we would not, even in the heat of that quarrel, bring against it a railing accusation. We would say, even of the Roman Church's present condition, in the words of the great Christian poet of our day,—

“ Speak gently of our sister's fall :
 Who knows but gentle love
 May win her at our patient call
 The surer way to prove ? ”

And we would not, at any rate, with the view of expressing our abhorrence of the corruptions of Popery as it is, concede to its advocates the uncalled for—the all-important admission, that those corruptions formed part of the general Christianity of Western Europe for nine hundred years. We would not, for the purpose of strengthening our case against such opponents, declare that all the good and great who during those centuries lived and died “beneath the Church’s shade” were on their side in the quarrel between us and them. We would not avow, or glory in the avowal, that our English Reformers were in truth separatists, though they disclaimed the name; or that our English Church was, during the whole of the long interval between Augustine and Cranmer, steeped in all the impurities of post-Tridentine Rome. We would not, we could not, while a spark of the principle of filial duty yet glowed within our breasts, join in the unthinking cry of those who, more familiar with modern prejudices than with ancient facts, seem to feel a positive pleasure while affixing the brand of shame,

“E’en here, between the chaste unsmirched brows
Of our true mother.”

We would not celebrate, or join those without the pale of our holy Church in celebrating, festivals unauthorized by any legitimate authority, and based upon the assumption of that Church’s long apostacy. We would not virtually proclaim to the world, in the teeth of historical facts, and of the declaration of Cranmer himself, that for nine centuries it was the system of that Church to withhold from the people all knowledge of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. That there was a period, though it was comparatively a short one, in which, in opposition to her system, her ministers did, first discourage, and then prevent, the study of the sacred records by their flocks, we would, as bound by Christian verity, admit; and over this, as over all other errors and sins of our spiritual parent in her earlier days, we would dutifully mourn; but we would no more acknowledge that those days were altogether dark in the heavens than that these our own days are one unclouded blaze of purity and light.

To that portion of the public which appears to regard a belief in the utter foulness and corruption of Rome, and of all churches which have held communion with her during any portion of the last twelve hundred years, as an essential article of Christian faith, the expression of notions like the above—nay, the very suggestion of them in the way of doubt and with the view of promoting historical inquiry—will savour of heresy—of impiety—nay, worst of all, of Popery itself. But we would, in all good-will and

charity, ask of the well-meaning persons who should, on grounds like these, instinctively exclaim against us, whether, if they have indeed so far incorporated in their minds their own uniuspired impressions of historical events and characters with the great doctrines of Revelation as to feel that in an attack on the former is involved an impugnement of the latter, they are not in principle committing the very offence with which they so vehemently charge the Romanists, by adding to the faith once delivered to the saints, and confounding dicta of mere human authority with the sublime system of truths revealed by the Almighty.

If it be Popery to vindicate the past from the charge of fully participating in the corruptions of the present: if it be Popery to declare that the position of the Roman Patriarch, as the systematic opponent of divine truth, is modern as well as unscriptural; that his adherents among ourselves are not, either in doctrine or by succession, the representatives of the churches originally established in our islands, being, on the contrary, the abettors of a recent and intruding sect; and that the proud boast of immutability made by the Church of Rome is a delusion, the difference between her and ourselves consisting in her disregard of, and our reverence for, the voice of Catholic antiquity; if the maintenance of these, and of tenets like these, be Popery, then, unquestionably, we should deserve to be called Papists. But, were it thus explained, we might glory in the title.

ART. V.—*The Life and Character of John Howe, M. A., with an Analysis of his Writings.* By Henry Rogers. London: Ball. 1836. 8vo. pp. 576.

WE learn from Mr. Rogers that all which has been preserved to us of the personal history of John Howe might have been preserved within half the compass of this volume. We are quite of his opinion. Nay, we are, further, satisfied that half the volume might have been amply sufficient for all the purposes of biography, together with a fair allowance for criticism and dissertation. But Mr. Rogers is evidently enamoured with his subject; and, moreover, (as we learn, with sorrow, from his preface,) he has been impelled to seek, in literary toil, for an anodyne against the effects of some great personal calamity. Under these circumstances it might seem ungracious, and almost inhuman, to be out of humour with him for a more than ordinary indulgence in the luxury of diffuseness.

That he should have been captivated with the task of recording the virtues of a man like Howe, is far from surprising; for Howe was one of those rare spirits, in which the elements are so happily

combined and blended, as to "give the world assurance" of an almost perfect Christian. It appears that Mr. Rogers has devoted himself to his "labour of love" with a zeal and industry quite worthy of that excellence, the memory of which he delighteth to honour. No source of information has been neglected by him, whether in manuscript or in print; and his diligence has not been without its reward. He has succeeded in rescuing from oblivion some highly interesting letters, and a considerable number of valuable facts, not to be found in the *Life of Howe* by Calamy.

It is bitterly to be deplored that the voluminous manuscripts of Howe, containing an account of his public and private life, were destroyed, in obedience to his last inexorable injunctions. It would seem as if he recovered his speech, (which he had lost,) very shortly before his death, for the express purpose of commanding this pitiable sacrifice; which has probably deprived the world of a more minute and circumstantial history of religion, in England, during the time of Howe, than can now be hoped for from any existing source. From the scanty materials which yet remain, we learn that John Howe was born at Loughborough, May 17, 1630. His father was minister of that place, by the appointment of Archbishop Laud; but was speedily removed on the ground of non-conformity. We are extremely concerned to find that Mr. Rogers, after having solemnly disclaimed all sectarian bitterness of feeling, has, in this early stage of the narrative, strangely forgotten his pledge, and has broken out into a vast deal of vulgar and ignorant invective against the archbishop,—such as might refresh the spirits of John Prynne himself, and his brother martyrs, if we could suppose that their tempers and principles have followed them into another world. It is, we know, insufferably wearisome to dwell upon these stale and turbid calumnies. But, tedious as it may be, we hold it "very stuff o' the conscience," never to suffer such things to pass without an indignant protest against their foul injustice.

"This excellent man," (the father of Howe,) says Mr. Rogers, "had been appointed to this parish by Archbishop Laud, but was not destined to remain there long. His arrogant patron attached little less importance to the most insignificant ceremonies than to the weightiest articles of the Decalogue. He could see no impropriety in sanctioning the public desecration of the Sabbath, while he was ready to visit the omission of the most trifling rites with relentless severity. As Howe's father, it seems, could not conscientiously comply with those solemn fooleries and minute and frivolous ceremonies, which the zealous archbishop persisted in introducing into public worship, and by which, whether he intended it or not, he was fast assimilating the Church of England to the Church of Rome, it was soon discovered that he was not the man for Loughborough, and he was consequently ejected. This can excite no sur-

prise; what could be expected from Laud—a man apparently so totally destitute of every rational conception of the spirit or essence of religion, and whose whole soul was immersed in pomp and ceremonial; who seemed to think the restoration of broken crucifixes and damaged paintings amongst the most sacred cares of his high office; who busied himself in adjusting the position of altars, in prescribing obeisances and grimaces, in attiring his priesthood in the gaudy fopperies of a childish superstition, and in brushing up the tawdry frippery of the Romish Church, which had lain neglected ever since the Reformation; whose own most solemn acts of public devotion were a tissue of fantastic and ridiculous mummeries; and whose superstition was of so mean and abject a character, that he gravely noted his dreams, regarded the fall of a picture as a serious omen, and rejoiced or trembled as the week or year brought round his lucky or unlucky days? Had the relentless spirit of persecution by which this man was animated been directed, however erroneously, against the gigantic abuses in the Church, he would at least have escaped our contempt, though not our abhorrence. But to see great power abused to such mean purposes, to see a tyrant with the soul of a deputy-master of ceremonies, is surely one of the most ridiculous as well as humiliating of spectacles.”—p. 19—21.

Now, in the first place, it is a most outrageous slander to affirm that Laud “saw no impropriety in sanctioning a desecration of the Sabbath.” Whether, or not, his views respecting the license which might fitly be allowed to public recreation on the Sabbath-day, were correct or incorrect, is a question totally distinct. But Mr. Rogers *must* know that this whole matter was hotly debated at the time. He *must* have heard of the Sabbatarian controversy; and, therefore, he *must* have been aware, while he was penning these very sentences, that the more indulgent theory was supported, not by Laud alone, but by men who were as incapable of giving encouragement to wilful Sabbath-breaking, as they were of giving utterance to blasphemy. Besides, it is perfectly notorious, and was never denied by his bitterest adversaries, that, in his own person, the Sabbath was always most devoutly honoured by Archbishop Laud. Secondly; to aver that, in Laud’s estimation, the weightiest articles of the Decalogue scarcely exceeded in importance the most insignificant ceremonies, is to proclaim a resolute and wilful blindness to the course of a whole life, distinguished by inflexible integrity, by purity which has never been impeached, and by munificence which nobles and princes would do well to emulate. Thirdly; what were the “solemn fooleries” that were to convert Protestant worship into a Popish melodrama? Why, the decent uniformity of clerical habiliments; the restoration of the communion-table to the primitive position, which, at this day, it occupies in all our churches; the deliverance, in short, of the Church of England from the reproach of

brutish and slovenly irreverence. But it surpasses all human patience to enlarge, in further detail, upon these miserable shreds and patches of worn-out detraction. Mr. Rogers has really wrought himself up into a fit of almost rabid violence, which is exceedingly ridiculous. He is evidently in a temper to "enact *Ercles*, or a part to tear a cat in." We hope and trust that a time of better knowledge, and more unclouded candour, may arrive, when he will be heartily ashamed of describing the author of the immortal Conference with Fisher, as "a tyrant, *with the soul of a deputy-master of the ceremonies!*"

But to proceed with the story of John Howe. At the age of seventeen he was removed to Christ's College, Cambridge; and there, it has been surmised, his mind received its "platonie tincture," from his intimacy with an illustrious triumvirate, Cudworth, Henry More, and John Smith. In July, 1652, he proceeded to the degree of M.A., and was soon afterwards *ordained*, at Winwick, in Lancashire, by *Mr. Charles Herle*, who succeeded Dr. Twiss, as Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly. His ministry commenced at Great Torrington, in Devonshire. What were his views at this period, relative to ecclesiastical polity and discipline, does not appear to be very clearly ascertained. According to Mr. Rogers, he was almost, if not altogether, a *Congregationalist*; but, nevertheless, was passionately desirous of some moderate and catholic scheme of union. That his labours, however, were indefatigable, is manifest from an account which Calamy received from Howe himself. And, if it be correctly reported, it shows that he must, at that time, have combined the ardour of a disembodied spirit, with the lungs of a trumpeter, and the brawn and stamina of a gladiator; a frame of adamant, with a soul of fire.

"He told me," says Calamy, "it was upon those occasions his common way to begin about nine in the morning, with a prayer for about a quarter of an hour, in which he begged a blessing on the work of the day; and afterwards read and expounded a chapter or psalm, in which he spent about three quarters of an hour; then prayed for about an hour, preached for another hour, and prayed for about half an hour. After this he retired and took some little refreshment for about a quarter of an hour or more, (the people singing all the while,) and then came again into the pulpit and prayed for another hour, and gave them another sermon of about an hour's length; and so concluded the service of the day, at about four of the clock in the evening, with about half an hour or more in prayer."—pp. 36, 37.

This is too much for his present biographer, or even for Calamy himself, who confesses that "the above service was one which "few could have gone through, without inexpressible weariness

“both to themselves and their auditors.” “Well,” says Mr. Rogers, “might the preachers of that day be called *painful* preachers! And surely their auditors were hardly less entitled to that unenviable distinction!” Seven mortal hours of preaching, prayer, and exposition, broken only by one brief pause of fifteen minutes; and that pause, too, allowed only to the minister, the congregation *singing all the while!*

About the commencement of the year 1657, some important business brought Howe to London. On the last Sunday of his stay, (which was accidentally protracted beyond the period fixed for his return,) curiosity led him to the chapel at Whitehall; and here, his majestic person and noble countenance attracted the attention of Cromwell, who, as Calamy tells us, “generally had his eyes everywhere.” When the service was over, Howe was greatly surprised by a summons to attend the Protector; and, with still more astonishment, received from his Highness a request to preach at Whitehall on the Lord’s day following. It was vain for Howe to represent that the good people of Torrington would be sorely grieved, and, perhaps, bitterly displeased, at his protracted absence. The Protector would hear of no excuse. He would undertake (he said) himself to procure a proper substitute. Upon this, the preacher found it impossible to stand out any longer. His first sermon was followed by a pertinacious demand for a second; the second was succeeded by a third; and the series ended in the settlement of John Howe at Whitehall as Domestic Chaplain to his Highness, who, after his manner, trampled down all difficulties which were started in the way of the arrangement. In this situation he remained till some time after the Protector’s death.

We have, in this place, an enormous length of disquisition respecting the motives by which Cromwell was prompted to this appointment. The eye of Despotism, we all know, is generally capricious. But the glance of Cromwell was doubtless that of deep sagacity. In one sense he was (like other men of capacious and overruling powers) a discerner of spirits. He could look men through and through. And, if we are to judge by the portrait prefixed to this volume, there was much in the countenance of Howe which might easily arrest the gaze of a watchful and restless observer of mankind. There was in his aspect that air of goodness, before which wickedness is often spell-bound; and there was, moreover, an air of greatness, in which the usurper may have recognized the indications of a mind, which stood forth, like his own, in bold relief, from the quotidian level of human mediocrity. And this, together with his desire to signalize his

reign by the services of distinguished men, may sufficiently account for this sort of extemporaneous election of a chaplain.

But, whatever may be the true solution of the enigma, if Cromwell expected, in his new spiritual adviser, an obsequious prophet, in whose lips a lying spirit should abide, he was most egregiously mistaken in his man. John Howe proved himself a very Micaiah, always prepared to say, *as the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak*. Of this, one glorious instance is related by Mr. Rogers. It was an opinion, or, at least, a profession, predominant in the Protector's court, that the *special favourites* of heaven were honoured with distinct intimations, not only of the success of their petitions, but of the particular mode in which their desires would be crowned with a prosperous issue. The court of Cromwell, of course, abounded with these *special favourites*; and consequently it required more than ordinary courage and integrity to stand up in the midst of this proud *election*, and to pour in the light upon their refuge of falsehood and absurdity. Yet this was the office which John Howe faithfully and intrepidly performed. He put forth his sentiments in a sermon "on a special faith in prayer," of which some imperfect notes have been preserved by Calamy, and are given by Mr. Rogers in his appendix. While he was delivering this discourse, prognostics of a gathering storm were observed on the countenance of the Lord Protector. He frequently knit his brows—a certain sign of his inward displeasure—and manifested other symptoms of impatience and uneasiness. The terrors of his eye, however, seemed to be wholly lost upon the preacher. He proceeded, with his usual sedateness of demeanour and cogency of argument. When he had finished, some person of distinction approached him, and asked him "whether he knew what he had done?" and, at the same time, expressed dismal apprehensions that he had irretrievably lost the esteem and favour of his Highness. John Howe replied, with perfect composure, that he had done what he conceived to be his duty, and could trust the issue with God. The issue, as it happened, was not so formidable as was probably anticipated by the whole court. The tempest, which had apparently been collecting on the brow of the autocrat, never actually burst upon the head of his audacious chaplain, though it often seemed on the point of coming down; for Howe himself told Calamy that his Highness was something more chilly in his manner than before, and looked, at times, as if he was full of the subject, and ready to speak to him upon it. So that he might say, like Trinculo, "yon same black cloud, yon huge one, looks like a foul bombard that would shed his liquor; it cannot chuse but fall by pailfuls." But it never did: and Howe was

left in unmolested enjoyment of the satisfaction derived from a faithful and intrepid discharge of his conscience.

There are several interesting and important letters recovered by Mr. Rogers from the Baxter manuscripts, in the library at Redcross Street; from which it appears that Howe was reconciled to the occupation of his dangerous and slippery position at Whitehall, by an earnest hope that it might afford him an opportunity, (to use his own words,)—of “setting up the worship and “discipline of Christ” in the Protector’s establishment, and of lifting up an honest testimony against the neglects and irregularities of public men. His task, we find, was sufficiently perplexing. Such was the disorderly license of the family, in all matters relating to God’s worship, that “it was about” as hopeful a course to preach in a “market, or in any assembly met by chance, as there.” It is evident that he would very gladly have retreated from a post, for which he modestly declared himself utterly unqualified. “I am”—he says—“naturally bashful, pusillanimous, easily brow-beaten; solicitous about the fitness “or unfitness of speech or silence; afraid (especially having to “do with those who are constant in the *arcana imperii*) of being “accounted uncivil or busy, &c.; and the distemper being natural (most intrinsically) is less curable.” He describes himself as “a *raw young man*, not likely to be considerable among *grandeess* ;” and complains that his work is little, his success little, and his hopes small. Baxter, however, seems to have known the man better than he knew himself; and was, manifestly, most anxious that he should remain firm in his arduous position. The result proved that Baxter was right: for Howe emerged from this fiery trial, with an unscorched reputation. The “*raw young man*” contrived to accomplish what has often baffled and defeated the maturest sagacity. He eminently combined discretion with courage, and moderation with integrity. And such was the felicity with which he achieved this triumph of wisdom, that men of all parties were unanimous in his commendation. “Never”—says Calamy—“can I find him so much as charged, even by “those who had been most forward to inveigh against a number “of his contemporaries, with improving his interest in those who “then had the management of affairs in their hands, either to the “enriching himself, or the doing ill offices to others, though of “known different sentiments. He readily embraced every occasion that offered, of serving the interest of religion and learning, “and opposing the errors and designs which, at that time, threatened both.”—The testimony of the usurper is still more noble and conclusive: “You have obtained”—said he to Howe—

"many favours for others; I wonder when the time is to come that you will solicit any thing for yourself or your family."

It is somewhat remarkable, that honest Richard Baxter, in this correspondence with Howe, exhibits, on one point, something more of the serpent's wisdom than we, at this day, are much in the habits of ascribing to him. "I would have you"—he says—"very tender and *cautelous* in publishing any neglects of the governors. A time there is for open and plain dealing. But, as long as the case is not palpably desperate and notorious, and you have leave to speak privately, that may suffice you. The welfare of the Church, and the peace of nations, lies much on the public reputation of good magistrates; which, therefore, we should not diminish, but promote." This prudent counsel is immediately followed by a suggestion, which was fit to be laid up in cedar, or in cypress, for the use of future generations.—"I would awaken your jealousy to a very careful, but very secret and silent, observance of the *Infidels and Papists*, who are very high and busy, in several garbs; especially of *Seekers, Vanists, Behmenists*. Should they infest our vitals, or get into the saddle, where are we then!" We know not what may be the feelings of our readers: but, to us, it almost seems as if the spirit of Richard Baxter were, at this moment, whispering the same caution—(*mutatis nominibus*)—in our own ears!—"The Lord Protector"—he continues—"is noted as a man of a catholic spirit, desirous of the unity and peace of all the servants of Christ;" (with a reserve, however, we apprehend, very similar to that of the good folks who prayed that, whatever else might betide, they might, at all events, be delivered from Popery, *Prelacy*, and Peveril of the Peak!) "We desire nothing in the world, at home, so much as the exercise and success of such a disposition. But more is to be done for union and peace. Would he (his highness) but, 1, take some healing principles into his own consideration; and 2, when he is satisfied in them, expose them to one or two leading men of each party, (Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational, Erastian, Anabaptist,) and privately feel them, and get them to a consent; and, 3, then let them be printed, to see how they will relish, (with the reasons annexed); and, 4, then let a free-chosen assembly be called to agree upon them;—he would exceedingly oblige and endear all the nations to him. And I am confident as I live, that, by God's blessing, he may happily accomplish so much of his work, if he be willing, as shall settle us in much peace, and heal abundance of our dissensions."

We have here the scheme of *comprehension*; that vision of enchantment, which was incessantly haunting the meditations of

Richard Baxter: a *comprehension* which was to *comprehend*, and to amalgamate, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Erastians, and Anabaptists! Why, the Protector might have shaken these ingredients together, till his giant arm was weary with the exercise: and, for a time, perhaps, the compound might have preserved some appearance of a perfect and intimate admixture. But nothing can well be more certain than the ultimate result. The materials would gradually have separated themselves; and each would have settled down in its original position and level; much after the fashion which any one may see exemplified, by shaking vinegar and oil together in the same bottle. Or, if any thing at all analogous to chemical action should have commenced between these multifarious elements, the combination would, doubtless, have turned out, in the end, a perilously explosive one; to the sore confusion, and possibly to the grievous damage, of the rash and ignorant experimenter. We find that John Howe, though of a truly Catholic and *comprehensive* temper, was much less venturesome, or much more sagacious, than his instructor. It is extremely diverting to observe the manner in which he deals with the proposal. He quietly asks, whether it might not be as well to begin the experiment with two of the ingredients, instead of tumbling the whole of them together, in the first instance; and, moreover, to select those two, between which the principle of repulsion seemed to be the least violent and dangerous? He submits, in short, whether it might not be “a more hopeful course, to attempt, “first, the reconciling only of the two middle parties, the Presbyterian and the Congregational?—inasmuch as the extreme “parties would be so much startled at the mention of an union “with one another, (as Anabaptists with Episcopalians, or with “Presbyterians,) that it might blast the design at the very beginning. “But if those two parties could be brought together first, endeavours might afterwards be used for drawing in the rest, “probably with more success: and, therefore, whether accordingly, it were best to present to his Highness only what might “serve that end.”

But although John Howe was, beyond comparison, less sanguine than his venerated counsellor, and perceived that the *union*, in Baxter's contemplation, would, eventually, very much resemble the *union* of the elements, before the Creative Power descended upon them,—he was yet extremely anxious for the establishment of a friendly intercourse between ministers of all denominations. His views and wishes relative to this matter, are expounded in a document in his own handwriting, which was found by Mr. Rogers among the Baxter manuscripts; and which appears to

have been the copy of some proclamation, drawn up by him at the command of the Protector, during his residence at Whitehall. In the latter part of that paper, is a clause to the following effect,—"that godly ministers be invited to maintain, as far as possible, "a Christian and brotherly communion with each other. And, "to that end, that they hold frequent meetings together, within "convenient circuits, for amicable debating of all the things "wherein they differ; and the strengthening one another's hands "in the things wherein they agree; the repressing the growing "errors of the times; and carrying on, with as much unanimity "and consent as may be, the great work they are engaged in." This was John Howe's favorite project. It was, doubtless, far less visionary than the scheme of Richard Baxter. But it is very easy to perceive the tendency of the procedure. It must, if widely adopted, have been powerfully instrumental in bringing down the Church to the same dead level, on which the endless multitude of sects were disporting themselves and taking their pastime; a consummation highly acceptable, of course, to all who regarded episcopacy as, at the very best, nothing more than one among the manifold existing varieties of ecclesiastical polity. We have had abundant opportunities, in our own day, of witnessing the result of a long course of experiments, instituted very much in the spirit of John Howe's proposal. For, what are miscellaneous associations of Churchmen and Dissenters, but meetings, in which "circumstantial matters relative to church "order and discipline" are to be forgotten, and men of all persuasions are to enter into a holy alliance against the powers of evil? And how beautiful has been the effect of this *eclectic* process, in diluting the virulence of High Church bigotry; and in neutralizing the pernicious quality of exclusive principles; and of diffusing the blessed and pacific influence of liberal and truly catholic notions!! Truly, the spirit of John Howe might have rejoiced to see the things which we see; and to hear the things which we hear.

And yet,—while we are writing,—we feel somewhat conscience-stricken. We suspect, that, in our haste, we have done injustice to his memory. We do verily believe,—on better reflection,—that there are a great many things, in our time, which John Howe would *not* rejoice to see and hear. He would not rejoice to behold an alliance, "most foul, strange, and unnatural," between the Infidels, and the Papists, and the Dissenters of this age: for the words of Baxter would have still been ringing in his ears—"should the Papists, or the Infidels, infest our "vitals, or get into the saddle, where are we then?" He would not rejoice to see the savage and motley host of radicalism

swelled by a furious rush and influx from the ranks of Nonconformity. He would not rejoice to see "the winds untied, to fight against the Church;" or to hear the voice, which is borne upon the tempest, loudly demanding her destruction. He would not rejoice to see the religion of the land *supported by voluntary contribution*; and the clergy degraded by an abject dependence on the capricious bounty of their congregations. John Howe would *not* rejoice to see, and to hear, such things. He was a loyal and a peaceable man; and, moreover, he was an eminently wise man. And we cannot suppress a strong persuasion, that, if he were living now,—to behold the countenance and the bearing of modern Nonconformity,—he would look, with a yearning heart, upon the Church, which the spirit of the age is labouring to rend to pieces. He would, probably, be impelled to search, once more, into those "seeming virtuous" principles of ultra-Protestant liberality, which are threatening the whole constitution of the Church with ruinous dislocation. And the result might be, that he would find no rest for the sole of his feet, but on the firm ground of primitive antiquity; and be numbered among the faithful sons and champions of the national communion.

We are considerably fortified in this surmise, by the fact, that Howe never ceased to regard the rulers of the Church with respect and reverence. He was, moreover, always ready to do benevolent and generous offices to the distressed Episcopalians. Among many instances of his friendly feeling towards them, one is, more especially, worthy of honourable record. When the celebrated Seth Ward was candidate for the Principalship of Jesus College, Oxford, he solicited the support and interest of Howe. And nobly did the Protector's chaplain justify the confidence which prompted the application. He spoke, in language of the highest admiration, of the worth and learning of the applicant; and even represented to Cromwell that the failure of such a man would be signally discreditable to the government; more particularly, as he had the voice of a majority of the fellows. It so happened, that the promise of the Protector had been given to another man. But, even so, to Cromwell's honour, the suit was not altogether unsuccessful; for he declared to Ward that, on the strength of such recommendations, he was much disposed to give the candidate some token of his regard. He then asked what was the value of the principalship: and, having heard, from the doctor, what it was *computed* to be worth, he promised to make him an annual allowance to the same amount.

After the death of Oliver, Howe remained at Whitehall, until the deposition of Richard Cromwell, for whose integrity and

worth he entertained the deepest veneration. By this time, the state of affairs was such as to make a longer residence in London intolerably painful to him. In a letter of his to Baxter, now published for the first time, he says, "such persons as are now at the head of affairs, will blast religion, if God prevent not. The design you writ me of, some time since, to introduce infidelity and popery, they have opportunity enough to effect. I know, some leading men are *not Christians*. Religion is lost out of England, further than as it may creep into corners. Those in power, who are friends to it, will no more suspect these persons, than their own selves. I am returning to my old station, being now at liberty beyond dispute. May 21 (1659)." And so, Howe went back to Torrington; hoping to *flee away and be at rest*. But, alas! his rest was not long! He was ejected under the Act of Uniformity; and consigned, together with his family, to a long period of indigence and privation. From a conversation held by him with his friend Dr. Wilkins, afterwards Bishop of Chester, it appears that one of his objections against the Establishment was, not so much the peculiar nature of its discipline, as its want of any discipline at all. Another of his difficulties was, that "he could not recognize, in the present constitution, those *noble and generous principles of communion*, which, he thought, must, sooner or later, characterize every church of Christ; that, consequently, when that flourishing state of religion should arrive, which he thought he had sufficient warrant, from the word of God, to expect, a constitution, which rested on such an *exclusive basis*, must fall: that, believing this to be the case, he was no more willing to exercise his ministry under such a system than he would be to dwell in a house built on an insecure foundation."

The former of these objections manifestly has reference to the absence of all such ecclesiastical discipline as may effectually controul the vices of individuals: an objection, we greatly fear, well-nigh inseparable, not only from all national religious establishments, but from all very large religious communities whatever. With regard to the other objection, it would have been particularly agreeable and instructive if John Howe had been pleased to mention distinctly those "*noble and generous principles of communion*," which may be reasonably expected to "characterize the Church of Christ." What principles of communion were *noble and generous enough* to satisfy him, it is absolutely vain to conjecture, from any thing which he has here set forth. And, of course, it would be equally vain, to guess the extent of acceptance, which the same principles would have met with, among the multifarious varieties of Nonconformity. We much suspect that

the standard of *nobleness and generosity* would have been found most provokingly diverse! It is well known, that the late celebrated Robert Hall was, at one time, a vigorous advocate for liberal communion: and yet even Robert Hall was, at last, driven to lament, and to reprobate, the irruption of Socinians into the *orthodox* dissenting connections. Let the line of comprehension be drawn where it may, there will always be numbers to complain that the boundaries are *ignobly and ungenerously* narrow; and to clamour against the bigotry which should resist their further extension. Again,—we should be very curious to know, as nearly as possible, what are the precise dimensions of that *basis*, upon which the Church is to rest securely, when the palmy and flourishing state of religion shall arrive? If it be an *exclusive basis*, we are told the Church must fall. And yet the basis can scarcely be so broad, but that something, after all, must be *excluded*. And, if so, how is the charge of *exclusiveness* ever to be got rid of? That union and godly concord will “characterize the Church of Christ,” in the days of its perfection, will scarcely be disputed. But, of one thing we may be quite certain,—that the union and the concord of that blessed time, will *not* be the result of a lax and licentious compromise of principles,—whether they relate to discipline or to doctrine. It will rather, we may reasonably presume, be the result of a more general, and more perfect knowledge of the truth, together with a more entire submission of the understanding and the will to the influence of heavenly things. In the mean time, how, on earth, are *principles of communion* to be settled, or the *basis* of the Church to be measured out, but by consulting the oracles of God, and the practice of the earliest and purest times, and the unanimous sense of those holy men, to whom the faith was originally delivered? It seems evident to us, that the mind of Howe was peopled with dreams of unity and comprehension, which, like many other dreams, were infinitely more remarkable for their brightness than for their distinctness. At all events, if a pattern of the tabernacle was revealed unto him, in his mount of vision, he has left us, here, but scanty means of discerning its outline, or of tracing clearly its plan and elevation.

That the spectacle of disunion, perpetually before him, must have been bitterly afflicting to this single-hearted man, it would be most injurious to question. He must have perceived that such a condition of things was in deadly opposition to the spirit of the Gospel, and to the example of primitive times. Here was an endless multiformity of sects, all in a state of incessant and mortal strife with each other; or, never *at an agreement*, except when the Church was to be assailed! And how was all this

stunning discord to be composed? Why, truly, by a cordial harmony in essential matters of doctrine; and by a magnanimous disregard for all subordinate particulars of practice, and of government. Only establish the unity of the *spirit*, and righteousness of life; and then, the bond of peace would, straightway, become indissoluble! The militant Church might wear the most motley variety of uniform, and adopt the most different schemes of tactics and of discipline;—regulars, militia, volunteers, all might follow their own principles of action, in glorious independence of each other;—and, still, all would be well, if the *heart* of this multifarious body were *but* as the heart of one man! All this while, alas! the Lady of the Seven Hills would be looking on with secret exultation. She well knows, that no battle can be fought with her, but by the compact columns of the Protestant Episcopal Church. And hence it is that she hates that Church with a fierce and deadly hatred. And hence it is, that she not only delights to see her baited and worried by the pack of Non-conformity, but is ever ready to *halloo* them on upon the game; and, not only so, but to join with them in the savage sport of the chase. And, still more would she delight to see the Church's sacred strength departing from her; as, most undoubtedly, and most speedily, it would depart, if she should once suffer her ranks to be disturbed, and her movements confounded, by the influx of a miscellaneous and ill-ordered levy. *Unity*, indeed, might be the result of the experiment. But it would be the *unity* of a mob: a *unity* which would be dashed into "ten thousand flaws," on the first argumentative collision with the well-trained battalions of the Papacy.

We shall not attempt to follow Mr. Rogers through his long and somewhat angry *diatribe* on the Act of Uniformity, and the spirit in which it was carried into execution. It is a passage of history, we must honestly confess, which we love not to dwell upon! And we know of no good purpose that can be answered by heating ourselves with a review of those heavy times; seeing that such times never can return. *The danger, now, is from a very different quarter!*

We turn, with pleasure, to the brightest portion of the life of this excellent man. For six years, he had been bearing up, bravely yet meekly, against a sore fight of afflictions. His income had been scanty, and miserably precarious. He had been "steeped in poverty to the very lips." And, as he was now surrounded by a young and numerous family, he tasted the waters of adversity in all their bitterness. The righteous, however, was not forsaken. About the year 1671, he was invited to become domestic chaplain to Lord Massarene, of Antrim Castle,

in Ireland: and the invitation was accompanied with the most liberal and advantageous offers. The proposal was gratefully embraced. He embarked for Dublin early in the year; and was, shortly after, joined by his whole family, at the mansion of his noble and generous patron. His journey was distinguished by a striking, but somewhat whimsical occurrence. He was detained at Holyhead, for some considerable time, by adverse winds. The passengers were numerous, and anxious that the period of their detention should not pass without the benefit of Mr. Howe's religious ministrations. While they were in search of a secluded spot on the sea-shore, the clergyman of the parish happened to pass by, attended by his clerk. The clerk, on being interrogated whether his master was to preach on that day, replied that his master never preached at all! He was accustomed only to read prayers. On this, his reverence himself was asked whether he would allow a minister, then in the town, to occupy his pulpit for that day. The parson instantly acceded to the proposal: and John Howe preached, accordingly, in his customary impressive manner. The fame of the morning sermon brought together a very large and attentive congregation in the afternoon. The wind continued foul for another week. And, when the clergyman entered the church on the following Sunday—"expecting," says Mr. Rogers, "the usual scanty attendance of hearers, to accompany him in the usual *frigid* service"—he beheld the place crowded with a prodigious concourse of people. His consternation was unspeakable! Provision he had none, wherewith to satisfy the hungering and thirsting multitude. In this appalling exigency, nothing was to be done but to implore the presence of the same wonder-working man, the rumour of whose spiritual affluence had brought together this exceeding inconvenient assemblage. The clerk was accordingly despatched. He found John Howe sick in bed. His indisposition, however, was, fortunately, not severe enough to disable him from answering the summons. He, afterwards, declared that he had seldom preached with more fervour and energy, and never saw a congregation more attentive or devout. A few days after this, he set sail for Ireland: leaving the incumbent in a predicament, by no means the most enviable that can be imagined. How the sermonless man demeaned himself, under these new and awkward circumstances, we are not informed. But, alas! we fear it must be concluded that he was *molested* no more with overflowing congregations!

The five happiest years of his life were passed by Howe at Antrim Castle. In 1675, he was called from this delightful and peaceable retirement, in which he composed several of his most admired and useful works,—viz. *The Vanity of Man as Mortal*;

the treatise on *Delighting in God*; and the first part of his greatest performance, "*The Living Temple*." The circumstance which removed him from the household of his noble friend, was an invitation to take charge of a congregation which had recently lost its pastor, Dr. Lazarus Scaman. The deceased, it seems, was one, whose principles of communion were not quite so *noble and generous* as Howe would have desired: for he was a rigorous Presbyterian, and a sturdy champion of the *divine right* of that form of church polity. Nevertheless, Howe was elected to succeed him; though not with a perfectly harmonious call. The "*Declaration of Indulgence*," which had been put forth during his residence in Ireland, was not then in force. It was revoked by the king in 1673; his majesty being then in need of another subsidy: for which cause,—as Mr. Rogers observes, and as we most potently believe,—he would willingly have repealed the whole Decalogue! But, though the edict itself was annulled, its spirit appeared to survive in sufficient force to mitigate the execution of the laws against Nonconformity; and, under the protection of this comparatively tolerant disposition, John Howe resumed the exercise of his ministry, unvexed by the swarm of scruples which buzzed about the fastidious consciences of many of his Nonconforming brethren. It should never be forgotten that, at this period, he lived on terms of intimacy with many among the most distinguished ornaments of the Established Church; for instance, with Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Sharp, Whichcot, Kidder, Fowler, and Lucas. We further learn from Calamy, that he might, if he had been so pleased, have enjoyed, if not the friendship, at least the protection and the countenance, of an extremely *illustrious* person among the laity—probably, that fantastical "*epitome of all mankind*," the Duke of Buckingham. It was the pleasure of that nobleman, during the national delirium of the Popish plot, to become, on a sudden, most violently well-affected towards the oppressed sectarians! And it was about this same time, that a certain great man expressed himself desirous of an interview with John Howe. On hearing this, Howe took an opportunity of waiting on the personage in question. In the course of their conference, the duke—(if he were the man)—formally propounded his belief, that, truly, the Nonconformists were much too numerous and powerful to be any longer neglected. They, undoubtedly, were deserving of regard. And, if they were but provided with a friend near the throne, whose influence and counsel might be at their service on all critical emergencies, it must, on every account, be wonderfully to their advantage, &c. &c. &c. The general proposition being laid down, the great man proceeded to intimate, very intelligibly,

though indirectly, that he might, himself, be, perhaps, prevailed upon to undertake the office of their advocate and representative at court. This was to spread a net in the very sight of a bird, much too old and sagacious to be caught. Howe replied to the suggestion, with a great appearance of simplicity, that there was one difficulty in the way of this arrangement. The Nonconformists were, avowedly, a religious people. It would, therefore, be of deep importance to their cause that the individual entrusted with the protection of their interests should be one who would not be ashamed of *them*, and of whom they might have no reason to be ashamed. And, he submitted, that it might turn out an extremely difficult matter to find any one who should combine, in his own person, these two indispensable qualifications. By this gentle and quiet *puff*, the project was extinguished, in one instant.

In 1680, John Howe felt himself compelled to enter the lists of controversy against Stillingfleet. Every one has heard of Stillingfleet's sermon on the "Mischief of Separation." On this occasion, it must be confessed, the great divine *took fire into his bosom*, with the usual consequences of such an adventure. In an evil hour, he committed himself to the prodigious averment, that, "although the *really conscientious* Nonconformist is justified in not worshipping after the prescribed forms of the "Church of England, or rather would be *criminal* if he did so; "yet is he not less *criminal* in setting up a separate assembly." "Such is the pleasant dilemma,"—observes Mr. Rogers,—"to "which, according to this writer, the sensitive consciences of the "Nonconformists had reduced them. An inevitable necessity "of *crime*, was the direct consequence of their scrupulous anxiety "to avoid it." The *dilemma*, indeed, was one of more than usually formidable aspect: for,—according to the following statement of Mr. Rogers, which we profess not to gainsay,—it was armed with *three* murderous horns. "It was at the peril of "the Nonconformists, if they worshipped with the Church of "England. It was at their peril, if they worshipped in the Con- "venticle. And it certainly was not less at their peril, if they "abstained from worship altogether!"

When this discourse was printed, Howe was in the country. He there received a copy of it, together with a letter against it, "from a person of quality;" who was, evidently, as angry and intemperate as the dean himself. John Howe, on the other hand, was one of those who loved an answer, soft enough to turn away wrath, though hard enough to make an impression upon reason. He, accordingly, published a reply, both in defence of the Nonconformists, and in palliation of the violence

with which they had been assailed. The reply was in the form of a letter to his wrathful correspondent: and, undoubtedly, if nothing else were extant of his writing, this paper alone would be a monument sufficient to immortalize his meek and patient wisdom. A few sentences may be sufficient to show the gentleness with which he attempered his unflinching fidelity to the cause of his brethren. "I would have you"—he says to the *person of quality*—"I would have you consider, how great reason you have to believe, that this blow came only from the somewhat misgoverned hand of a pious and good man Believe him, in the substance of what he said, to speak according to his *present* judgment We ourselves do not know, had we been, by our circumstances, led to associate and converse mostly with men of another judgment, what our own would have been I am highly confident, notwithstanding what he hath said, that, if it were in his power, we might even safely trust him to prescribe us terms; and should receive no hard ones from him." It is devoutly to be wished that the lions of controversy would imitate John Howe; and roar, as he does here, after the fashion of the nightingale! The world would be spared a vast deal of harassing dissonance: and the demon, which walks abroad in troublous times, might then, perhaps, be tamed, if not expelled, by a cunning like to that which calmed the tempestuous spirit of Saul.

In the same year, 1680, the temper and the judgment of Howe were again put on trial, and obtained a signal and most honourable triumph. A sermon had been delivered by Tillotson before the King; in which he maintained, that "no man is obliged to preach against the religion of his country, though it be a false one, unless he has the power of working miracles." His Majesty, of course, was fast asleep, during the delivery of this discourse. But, afterwards, when one of the court condoled with him, for having lost, during his slumbers, the rarest specimen of *Hobbism* he had ever heard, he exclaimed, "'Odsfish, he shall print it then." And it was printed accordingly; and a copy of it was sent to Howe by Tillotson himself. Howe instantly drew up a long letter of earnest expostulation; in which he lamented that a sermon against Popery should, in effect, "plead the Popish cause against the Fathers of the Reformation." This protest, without loss of time, he placed in the hands of Tillotson; who, having glanced over its contents, proposed an amicable discussion. The scene of this discussion, was the inside of Tillotson's chariot: in which, as they rode together, he enlightened the preacher with such a fearful exposition of the dangerous nature of his doctrine, that Tillotson was agitated, even to weeping, and

confessed that this was among the most unfortunate incidents of his life. He pleaded, however, that he had preached upon an unexpected summons; that, in his haste, he had fastened on the terrors of Popery, a subject which then absorbed the public mind; that the order to print followed immediately after the sermon had been delivered; and that, consequently, he was deprived of all opportunity of revision. What might have been the result of a meeting, such as this, between two thunder-clouds, from opposite regions of the heavens, may easily be imagined! As it was, the conference showed that the elements of peace and candour had not wholly perished from the world.

In 1681, the fury of persecution was again let loose upon the Nonconformists. For the next two years, Howe himself scarcely dared to appear in the streets. In 1684, the severity was such as to extort from him a letter of expostulation to Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, who had vehemently insisted on the necessity of a rigorous execution of the laws. But still, no venomous *root of bitterness* was found to spring up, among the feelings which were naturally engendered in his heart by the sufferings of the time. He concluded his letter with a prayer, that, "if the prelate had either *misjudged*, or *misdone* against his judgment, God would rectify his error by gentler methods, and by less affliction, than he had designed for his brethren." And he concluded with the expression of his firm belief, that he should "meet him, one day, in the place where Luther and Zuinglius are well agreed." In 1685 he gladly accepted the invitation of Philip, Lord Wharton, to accompany him in his travels on the continent, and so to escape from the miseries which he could neither avert nor mitigate. With this nobleman he visited several of the most celebrated cities of Europe, and enjoyed the society of learned men of various parties. In 1686, he took a large house at Utrecht for the reception of English lodgers. In 1687, James II. put forth his celebrated Declaration of Indulgence. John Howe was then in England, and was foremost among those Nonconformists who saw through that mystery of iniquity, and looked upon the treacherous gift with suspicion and contempt. At length the Toleration Act, which followed speedily in the train of the Revolution, finally cut asunder those inextricable knots, which had so long been chafing the consciences, and worrying the intellects, of every religious party in the land. In the proceedings which terminated in this happy issue, Howe, as might be expected, was prominently engaged. By him was drawn up "the Case of the Protestant Dissenters," in which the whole matter was "represented and argued" with great ingenuity and power, but, nevertheless, with his customary command of temper.

The period was now come when the absence of all external force was to make manifest the violence of the repulsive principle which, all this time, had been secretly at work throughout the whole mass of Nonconformity. To use the words of Mr. Rogers—"relieved from the fear of persecution, the Nonconformists began to quarrel among themselves. Pressure from without had hitherto kept them together, and its removal was the signal for internal dissension." Now, let no man suppose that this very natural phenomenon is produced by us for the purpose of vindicating a system of persecution. For any such purpose it is altogether worthless. But it is not worthless when resorted to for the purpose of exposing the extreme complication of the problem which the advocates of *liberal and comprehensive* principles had been eternally proposing to the rulers of the Church. By the adoption of almost *any* scheme of *liberality and comprehension*, the pressure from without would have been as effectually lifted off as it actually was by the system of toleration. And what would have been the result? Why, obviously, this,—that the quarrelling and the dissension would inevitably have been imported into the body of the Church itself, instead of raging without the boundaries of her enclosure. And who can describe the exultation with which the Papists would have contemplated this triumph of confusion? "The first symptoms of dissension," says Mr. Rogers, "betrayed themselves shortly after the publication of the *Heads of Agreement* (as they were most infelicitously called) by the *United Ministers*." And what was the object of the resolutions which were followed by all this discord, but "a *formal* coalition between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists;" that is, between those very sections of the Nonconforming body, which, in Cromwell's time, were considered by Howe himself as the most hopeful subjects for an experiment of conciliation! These evils, however, were altogether insignificant, when compared with the fierce agitation of the Antinomian controversy, occasioned by the reprinting of the works of Dr. Crisp—a man whom Mr. Rogers has done what he could to immortalize, by declaring that he "had a patent for nonsense and folly, which defied successful imitation." Such was the virulence of this conflict, that "the press teemed with pamphlets on both sides, till party spirit became inflamed to a pitch of bitterness altogether unprecedented." In vain did Howe attempt to allay the storm by his discourses on "the Carnality of Religious Contention." The voice of reason and of charity was lost in the roar of the tempest. An open rupture was the consequence, which drew forth from Howe a most affecting discourse upon the text,—*There is none that calleth on thy name; that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee. For thou*

hast hid thy face from us, and hast consumed us, because of our iniquities.

Of Howe, little more is to be heard for several years, except that he was employed occasionally in the office of negotiating marriages between certain honourable and religious families. Early in 1702, the question of "Occasional Conformity" was brought into agitation, and involved him in some "unpleasant controversy." The history of this question may be very briefly stated. From the commencement of the "Great Schism," in 1662, occasional communion with the Church of England had been practised by many of the more moderate Nonconformists, both lay and clerical; and this, *first*, upon the ground that the Church was an *establishment*, under some modification of which they would have been willing to conform, although they were unable to approve its present constitution; and, *secondly*, with a view to the public recognition of the principle, that an essential unity exists among Christians of *all denominations*. This last was the favourite notion of John Howe. The lawfulness of this sort of conformity was a matter to be determined by each man for himself, according to the state of his own individual conscience. The sole question to be settled was, whether such communion could be practised without sin; and this question could be disposed of only by an unfettered exercise of private judgment. Now, private judgment, as every one must be aware, is a hobby by no means remarkable for the steadiness and regularity of its paces. It is very apt to run away with its rider; and to toss the head, and to lift the heel, and to snuff the wind, like the wild ass of the desert, which laugheth at bit or bridle! It has hurried us into a difficulty, out of which we are unable to see our way. We are at a loss to understand how, if constant Conformity were sinful, occasional Conformity could well be otherwise. This, however, is a quagmire which does not appear to have sunk beneath the weight of John Howe; and there was one distinguished member of his congregation equally fortunate. This was Sir John Abney, whose hobby carried him in safety and quiet over this dangerous ground. The ease, however, with which he skimmed across it, occasioned great surprise, and no little suspicion; for, when Sir John became Lord Mayor of London, in 1701, it was shrewdly surmised by some, that his desire to qualify for civil office gave speed and lightness to his movements. The celebrated Daniel De Foe was mounted upon a much more ponderous and unwieldy steed; and, accordingly, he was scandalized beyond endurance by the unbecoming agility of his fellow-travellers. His displeasure bristled up in the form of an anonymous pamphlet, the title-page of which he darkened with the following stern *apo-*

siopesis,—"If the Lord be God, follow him; but, if Baal, ———." In the preface to this publication, he called upon John Howe to vindicate the practice of occasional Conformity, if he could; or, if not, to condemn it—a challenge which, notwithstanding his reluctance, Howe felt himself compelled to answer. His reply was something hotter than the usual temperature of his compositions. But so much did he abhor debate, that he declared, at the close of his pamphlet, that nothing should provoke him to resume his pen. Daniel De Foe, it is well known, had no such abhorrence of controversy; and, accordingly, he enjoyed the honours of the last word. But, although Howe redeemed his promise, by abstinence from further publication, a letter on the subject was found among his papers, after his death, addressed to "A Person of Honour," in which the whole matter is briefly, but luminously, stated. The weakness of the case, as here represented by him, lies obviously in this,—that he complains of the exclusion of the Nonconformists, as the work of those who "take denominations, not from the *intimate essentials* of things, but merely from *loose and separable accidents*;" not perceiving, or not recollecting, that some things, which he considered as *loose and separable accidents*, could not in the conscientious judgment of others, be *separated*, without imminent danger to matters of *intimate and essential* importance. But, not to dwell on this, the following passage may be selected as an indication of the mild and gentle spirit with which he was accustomed to mitigate the acrimony of disputation. "Thanks be to God," he says, "we are not so stupid as not to apprehend we are under stricter, and much more sacred obligations, than can be carried under the sound of a name, to adhere to our reverend fathers and brethren of the Established Church, who are most united among themselves in duty to God and our Redeemer, in loyalty to our sovereign, and in fidelity to the Protestant religion; *as with whom, in this dubious state of things, we are to run all hazards, and to live and die together.*" There is not more difference between the murmurings of a dove, and the screams of a ravening eagle, than there is between these pacific accents of John Howe, and the cry which is constantly issuing, at the present day, from the throat of modern Nonconformity.

It is curious enough that they who had once complained of the Nonconforming conscience as too rigid, at length began to reprobate its dangerous elasticity! And it is still more remarkable, that the *illiberally* scrupulous Bill against occasional Conformity, after having passed the House of Commons, was rejected by a decided majority of the House of Lords; but, nevertheless, without any talk of a *collision*. While the matter was pending, a

paper was drawn up by Howe for the purpose of exposing the absurdity of the measure. The merits of the question are there exhibited by him in the form of an hypothetical case. Sir T—— and Sir J—— are two gentlemen of equal estates. Sir T—— is a Churchman, who *seldom*, indeed, goes to church, but *never* to the conventicle. He is, moreover, a person of irregular habits, and a very comfortable laxity of moral principle. Sir J——, on the contrary, is an extremely sober and virtuous individual, who is punctual in the worship of God, but who sometimes frequents the *one sort of assembly*, and sometimes the other. Nevertheless, Sir J—— is declared incapable of any civil or military office; while Sir T—— is made capable of all. Can anything be more monstrous? &c. &c. &c.! Now, let the measure in question be as absurd and indefensible as it might, it is quite clear that this mode of attempting the exposure of its folly, is almost equally absurd. It is altogether unworthy of the mind of John Howe. He ought to have seen that the merits of any *general* measure can never be legitimately brought to the test of an extreme and imaginary case, such as the fancy of a zealous advocate may always supply. The proposed law might be villainously bad. But its badness could never be proved merely by showing that there were some vicious men in the ranks of the Church, who might profit by the law; and some worthy men among the occasional Conformists on whom the law might inflict disparagement and injury. The same sort of reasoning would be just as effective for the purpose of demonstrating the absurdity of considering a profession of Christianity (or, at least, the absence of any profession to the contrary) as a needful qualification for office in a Christian country. For instance: A. is a respectable and virtuous Mussulman, punctual in the discharge of his own religious duties, and faithful to all the essential moralities of life. B., on the other hand, calls himself a Christian, but lives in the practice of many things which, virtually, give the lie to his profession. Notwithstanding this, A. is shut out from all hope of public or professional advancement; while the career of honour and emolument is open to a worthless competitor. Can anything be more iniquitous and more absurd! * The writer, however, seems to have been destitute of all con-

* If John Howe were now living, he would probably be somewhat startled to find that the principle of his argument had actually been followed out to this full extent. In the short debate which took place in the House of Commons, on Tuesday, May 31, 1836, relative to the expediency of removing the civil disabilities of the Jews, it was distinctly and stoutly contended by several honourable members, that there could be no good reason why Jews, Turks, Heretics, and Infidels should not be admitted to all the rights and privileges of British subjects. And the motion in favour of the Jews was accordingly carried by a majority of 70 to 19. If the Bill should succeed, even the *theory* of a Christian legislature must of course be formally and deliberately abandoned.

sciousness that he was wielding a treacherous fallacy. Nay, he is so full of confidence in the weight and keenness of his weapon, that he flourishes it about with a vehemence somewhat unusual with him.

"Can it be supposed," he exclaims, "that the nation will be always drunk? Or if ever it be sober, will it not be amazed there ever was a time when a few ceremonies, of which the best thing that ever was said was that they were indifferent, have enough in them to outweigh all religion, all morality, all intellectual endowments, natural or acquired, which may happen in some instances to be on the wrong side, (as it must now be reckoned,) when, on the other, is the height of profaneness, and scorn at religion; the depth of debauchery and brutality, with half a wit, hanging between sense and nonsense: only to cast the balance the more creditable way, there is the skill to make a leg, to dance to a fiddle, nimbly to change gestures, and give a loud response, which contain the answer for the villanies of an impure life!"—p. 439.

But the period was now fast approaching, when this benevolent and holy man was to be removed beyond hearing of the tumult and the din of religious or political strife. In 1702 and 1703, the decays of nature began to do their accustomed work upon his bodily frame; though his mind still appeared to be exempt from their deadly influence. At the close of 1704, it was evident to his friends, that his further sojourning in the flesh would be but short. "His constitution had long been crumbling under a complication of maladies." Nevertheless, his decline was so gradual, that, in spite of much feebleness, he was still supported through a partial discharge of his customary duties. As the outward tabernacle was sinking, the spirit within appeared to be rising with greater intensity and vigour,—to be shaking itself from the dust,—and to be *putting on the beautiful garments* of immortality. On one occasion, we are told, that, at the celebration of the communion, he was rapt into such an ecstasy of joy and peace, that his audience expected to see him die, under the strength of his emotions. We shall hardly be suspected of much sympathy with the paroxysms of enthusiasm or fanaticism. But, nevertheless, we should have reason to take shame to ourselves if we were frigidly to suppress our belief that the souls of the righteous may, sometimes, be refreshed with prelibations and *antepasts* of heaven, at the period when they are about to take wing for that region of holiness and felicity. And, if ever there was a spirit upon earth more likely, than another, to be lifted to the mount, from which he might behold the promised land spread out distinctly before him,—so far as human judgment may pronounce, that spirit inhabited the bosom of John Howe.

Among those who came to visit him, towards the last, was

Richard Cromwell; then, like himself, deeply stricken in years. The interview between them was most solemn and affecting. Many tears were shed, on both sides: and much discourse was held, such as becomes those, who feel that, in this world, they have no abiding dwelling-place or city.

We find, however, that, with all his admirable and truly Christian fortitude, John Howe was not wholly exempted from the fears which, in some form or other, will frequently beset our poor and fallen nature. When the surgeon was puncturing the dropsical legs of Samuel Johnson, he called out to him to cut boldly, for that he cared not for bodily pain, but wanted length of days. Not so, John Howe. Length of days he valued not. But he shrunk from the trial of corporeal anguish. When his son, who was a physician, was lancing his gangrened leg, he anxiously demanded what he was doing? And, he added, I am *not* afraid of dying; but I *am* afraid of pain. Thus fearfully, thus wonderfully, and thus *variously*, are we made! And hence may we learn how rash, how presumptuous, and how uncharitable it is, to form hasty judgments, touching the spiritual condition of our brethren, from these varied struggles between the flesh and the spirit—from these “fears of the brave, and follies of the wise.” Well may we exclaim, with Jeremy Taylor,

Odi artus, fragilemque hunc corporis usum,
Desertorem animi.

But suffering and terror were, at this time, very near their close with John Howe. On the 2nd of April, 1705, he rendered up his spirit, peaceably and without a struggle.

It would be superfluous to attempt a full delineation of the character of this truly admirable servant of God. The foregoing outline of his life, we trust, may be sufficient to show that Howe was one of those men, whom the Lord is pleased, occasionally, to raise up in the world, apparently for the purpose of showing forth His power, and of manifesting the mighty working whereby He is able to subdue all things to himself. A truly honest man, it has been said, is the noblest work of God. But it is a work which, since man fell from his first estate, can only be produced by Redeeming Mercy, and Sanctifying Grace. And, when these have their perfect operation, the spectacle, undoubtedly, is one for men and Angels to look upon with delight and admiration. And seldom, surely, has their operation been more near to its perfection, than in the heart of this sainted Christian. We cannot, indeed, so far abandon or compromise our principles, as to forbear lamenting that he ever was impelled to separate himself from the Church. But, from this one ungraceful line in his

portrait—(for such, we must avow, it is, in our eyes),—we gladly turn away, to fix our regards on the majesty and beauty of the whole picture. And we scarcely can wish any thing better for the Church, than, that all her members, when they behold his excellence, may be provoked, by the sight, to a holy emulation.

With regard to his intellectual powers, the estimate of his biographer appears to us judicious and correct. His mind was not remarkable for the predominance of any one faculty. It was distinguished, rather, by the harmonious symmetry with which all the faculties were combined. It has frequently been observed, with respect to material and visible objects, that perfect proportions are found to lessen the overpowering effect, which would, otherwise, be produced by extraordinary grandeur of dimensions. And so it is with objects of which the senses take no cognizance. Thus,—all the powers of John Howe were unusually capacious : but yet, he might, perhaps, have more forcibly commanded the eye of posterity, if the light that was in him had been collected into one spot of intense brightness, instead of being diffused, “in serene and solemn lustre,” over the whole expanse of his mind.

The writings of Howe are copious ; but we apprehend that they are not, now, very generally read. This may partly be owing to the extreme intricacy, if we may so express it, of his rhetorical tactics and evolutions ; a fault extremely common at that period. The sermons, then, were furnished out with an elaborate and complex apparatus of divisions and subdivisions, which must, at all times, have wearied and distracted the mind of the hearer ; and which, in the present bustling and feverish age, would be intolerably harassing,—or, irresistibly narcotic ! The habit of much circuitous careering, before the preacher, or the writer, begins fairly to grapple with the main body of his subject, is apt to be another cause of grievous irritation, or exhaustion. And, so provokingly immoderate was this sort of preliminary exertation, in certain of the writings of John Howe, that Mr. Rogers tells us of a good woman who, once upon a time, was quite out of patience with it. She declared that “he was so long laying the cloth, that she always despaired of the dinner !”. Another peculiarity of Howe,—which must always have a repulsive influence,—is his want of mastery in the artifices of composition. It is well known that Robert Hall acknowledged the deepest obligations to the works of Howe ; but, nevertheless, he observed that “there was in him an innate inaptitude for discerning minute graces and proprieties.” His bullion was abundant, and of the purest quality ; but the mintage, for the most part, was coarse, unskilful, and inelegant. His diction was poor, and his style rugged. “Such limited powers of expression”—says Mr.

Rogers—"have seldom, if ever, been associated with such opulence and grandeur of intellect. He not only dispenses with every elegance, but often degrades the noblest thoughts by the meanest and most ordinary phraseology."

Our limits forbid us to follow Mr. Rogers through his analysis of the writings of John Howe. There is one among them, however, which tempts us to a few brief remarks; namely, his Discourse on "the Vanity of Man as Mortal." The admiration of Robert Hall for this Discourse, was quite enthusiastic. He was, himself, in the habit of frequently preaching on the same subject, and from the same text,—*Remember how short my time is. Wherefore hast thou made all men for nought.* Ps. lxxxix. 47. When solicited to publish his sermon, he evaded the request, by candidly avowing, that the whole of it would be found in John Howe. After the death of Hall, however, an outline of this sermon appeared, from the notes taken by the Rev. Mr. Grinfield.* The subject, undoubtedly, is one of surpassing interest and solemnity. It affords ample scope for the highest resources of sacred oratory. It irresistibly invites the preacher to dwell,—(as Hall and his prototype have done, with a prodigal application of their powers,)—on the shortness of life—on the depraved and miserable condition of the world—on the legion of diseases and infirmities which would *almost* seem to show that the body was formed to be a receptacle of pain—on the doom, which consigns by far the larger portion of mankind to a course of unvaried toil, converting the inheritor of vast capacities and lofty aspirations into something of little more intelligence than a piece of mechanism. And then, with what energy and animation will he, who hopes to be raised with a *spiritual body*, expose the coarseness and the meanness of merely sensual delight? And, not only so, but,—in looking forward to the time, when he shall see no longer, as in a glass, darkly,—how will he set at nought the baffling, we might almost say the perfidious, quality, even of intellectual pleasures, which are, generally, sure to break their promise to our hopes; and, while they swell out the pride of understanding, leave, after all, a craving void within the heart. And, then, he will ask, if this life is "the be all, and the end all," is *not* man made in vain? Is it not manifest that the destinies of a being, gifted with such powers, must be left unfinished, in a world which affords but imperfect satisfaction even to his lowest faculties, and leaves his highest in a state of frustration and of mockery? Now, all these, unquestionably, are noble and spirit-stirring common places; upon which it might be expected that

* Hall's Works, vol. vi. p. 177. Sermon viii.

any man, endowed with much imaginative power, and capable of profound moral emotion, might, for ever, pour out burning words, and breathing thoughts. But, still, they are *but* common places; and we greatly doubt whether they have in them, an anodyne virtue sufficient to charm down that feverish *unrest*, which is the peculiar malady of many a pure and contemplative mind. There, still, is *fixed* before our eyes, a dark and fathomless gulf of mystery, which this argument, precious as it is, can never close up. For, let us now turn to the other supposition. Man is *not* mortal; he is created for eternity,—and, therefore, not *in vain*. And, so long as any one can confine his thoughts to those, who are yearning for the time which is clearly to disclose the councils of Omnipotence, and fully to develope, and to exercise, the deathless capacities of the human soul,—to those who are labouring, day and night, to prepare themselves for that hour of retribution, which shall unveil all hidden things, and make straight all that is oblique to our eye—so long as any man can fix his thoughts on spirits of this stamp, so long will this argument appear bright and impenetrable as the whole armour of God. But, then, unhappily, there will, from time to time, rush in upon the mind, the thought of those innumerable myriads, who approach the gate of death without apparent consciousness of the *vanity* of their condition *here*,—without one desire which points towards any further completion of their destiny,—without the wish, and often without the opportunity, to seize upon the golden chain which the Saviour has suspended from the eternal throne, in order that, thereby, he might draw upwards all men unto himself. And what shall be said of these? Not, most certainly, that they are created *in vain*: for, whatever may be their lot hereafter, it cannot, without impiety, be doubted, that it shall illustrate, before the universe, the wisdom, the goodness, and the righteousness of God. Nevertheless, it must be confessed, that this same argument, which triumphantly rescues the constitution of the world from the imputation of *vanity*, yet leaves a still more fearful shadow hanging over the fate of that vast portion of the human race, of which, we fear, it may be said, *it were good for them, that they never had been born!* That they were not made *in vain*, is a consideration which scarcely can assuage the perplexity, and the anguish, and the terror, with which the anticipation of their future doom must ever weigh down the heart of every one who has “thoughts that wander through eternity!” They are reserved for a state unspeakably more terrible than *vanity*. The blackness of darkness may be their abode for ever.

There is, in truth, something inexpressibly appalling, in the reflection,—*not* that man, through much discipline and tribula-

tion, must enter into the kingdom of heaven,—but, that, in such an overpowering multitude of instances, the discipline and the tribulation, appear to fail of their effect; so that millions upon millions, who, being mortal, would be the heirs of *vanity*, must, in their immortality, be the heirs of perdition! There is room, here, for meditation, even to the verge of madness. And we apprehend that it would have been an office well worthy of a mighty preacher, to have dropped a word or two in season,—(touching a matter so intimately connected with his subject)—such as might soothe the pangs of the trembling and sensitive inquirer,—and still the waverings of them that are in search of rest,—and rebuke the taunting spirit that is ever working in the children of disobedience. It is one thing to show that man, as a creature of this world only, is walking in a vain shadow, and disquieting himself for nought. But it is another, and a far more arduous thing, to grapple with the *searchings of heart*, which must frequently arise, when we are pondering on the fate of those immense numbers who seem content with vanity, and at ease beneath the bondage of corruption.

It is true that we may be faithfully reminded by the preacher, of the *cure* as well as the *cause* of that *vanity*, in subjection to which, “the whole creation groans,” together with man. But still, the dreadful *fact* remains,—that the *cure* is, to all appearance, offered in vain to far the greater portion of mankind: and they, who receive it not, must perish in their sins. And when we muse upon these things, we feel almost impelled to break forth into the boldness which, sometimes, Jehovah permitted to his servants the prophets,—and to exclaim, *Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee: yet, let me reason with thee of thy judgments!* Why is it, that thy spirit striveth not unconquerably with the wicked, till they become weary of vanity, and are awakened by thy terrors, and subdued by the benignity of Him, who is the power of God, and the wisdom of God? Why is it that thy salvation is, still, like a light that shineth in a dark place? Why is it that,—if thou hast not *made* men in vain,—it should seem as if thou hadst, well-nigh, *redeemed* them in vain? How long, O Lord, holy, and just, and true, dost thou not lead captive the wills and the affections of sinful men, till they follow thy chariot-wheels in joy and triumph! Gird on thy sword, O thou most mighty; and, in thy majesty, ride prosperously forward, till vanity shall be no more, and meekness, and truth, and righteousness, shall inherit the whole earth!

But we must, now, dismiss the work of Mr. Rogers: which we do, with much respect for his abilities, and with a full acknowledgment of the general candour and moderation which per-

vade the volume. To be sure, we have, here and there, some fiery eruptions, which seem to speak of certain bituminous matters beneath the surface: as, for instance, when he talks of "ferocious bigotry"—and of "tomahawks and scalping-knives"—and of the tyrant prelate, with the soul of a deputy-master of "the ceremonies." But these little *capriccios* we are willing to forget, in the prevalent tone and spirit of the work. And we have only to add, that we hope he will not be implacably wrathful against us, for having presumed to lift up our testimony, in opposition to his assault upon the memory of Archbishop Laud. We do not quite despair of seeing the day, when, whatever may be his aversion for the principles of that eminent churchman, he may, at least, feel himself constrained to allow, that the primate was a man of unflinching honesty and courage; and that, even if his temperament was somewhat combustible, it was never kindled into flame by the breath of personal interest, or *selfish* lust of power.

ART. VI.—1. *Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, during the Month of February, 1836; to which are added, Two Sermons preached in Great St. Mary's, at the Evening Lecture.* By Henry Melvill, M.A. late Fellow of St. Peter's College. Cambridge: Deighton. London: Rivingtons. 1836. 8vo. pp. 141.

2. *Probation for the Christian Ministry practically considered. Four Discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge in the Month of March, 1836.* By the Rev. Thomas Dale, M.A. (of Corpus Christi College,) Vicar of St. Bride's, Fleet Street. London: Pelham Richardson. 1836. 8vo. pp. 107.

3. *The Unity of the Church in her Communion and Ministry. Two Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford, in March and April, 1836.* By the Rev. Robert Eden, M.A. late Fellow of Corpus Christi College. London: Hatchard & Son. 1836. 8vo. pp. 54.

4. *A Sketch of the Church of the First Two Centuries after Christ, drawn from the Writings of the Fathers down to Clemens Alexandrinus inclusive, in a Course of Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in January, 1836.* By the Rev. John J. Blunt, late Fellow of St. John's College. Cambridge: Deightons. London: Rivingtons. 1836. 8vo. pp. 218.

It has long been our pride and boast, that the theological stores of the Church of England are unequalled in any country. Germany is the only rival which can be fairly named; yet, without

seeking to depreciate the vast accessions to sacred literature which that land of learning has made, and even being ready to acknowledge that in some peculiar departments it may claim a superiority over England, our divinity, we may safely say, possesses a more useful, applicable, and available character, which invests it, beyond all other, with a practical as well as speculative value. It is an armoury, which has weapons always at hand, to be wielded against the infidel, the Socinian, the Papist, the fanatic, and the sciolist. It is formed of materials, as it were, at once solid and portable,—strong and massive, without being cumbrous or unwieldy. Moreover, from the time of the Reformation, amidst a few exceptions and deviations, by no means numerous enough or formidable enough to invalidate the force of the rule, it has preserved a discretion, and consistency, and moderation, to which German theology can hardly lay pretensions. The Scotch writers, with Dr. Chalmers at their head, however much they may prefer the forms of their own church, and however highly they may rate the pastoral assiduities of their own ministers, have cordially allowed this pre-eminence to the southern over the northern part of Great Britain, and have been glad to gather aid from the exhaustless magazine of our English divinity.

It is clear that this illustrious distinction can only be retained by the same means which originally secured it; namely, by not impoverishing the Church into a kind of literary starvation,—in other words, by leaving opportunities of learned leisure, and dignified posts, in which men of vigorous and cultivated minds may devote not merely the youthful energies, but the matured experience, of their minds to profound erudition and undistracted thought. In this point of view, perhaps, the prospects before us are not bright; but, in other respects, the anticipations which we may form as to the preachers and writers, who are now ascending the horizon, and likely to direct by their light the rising generation, are happier and more favourable, than would be a survey of the immediate present, or a retrospect of much which has very lately past. That survey, that retrospect, we may hereafter be compelled to make; but we now turn to the gratifying task of looking forward.

The Report of the Church Commissioners shows, that attention has been directed to the improvement of clerical education; and that great object may be said to be in the course of attainment, which the Bishop of Gloucester, the Master of the Temple, the Chancellor of the diocese of Chester, and many others, have long urged with untiring and unconquerable zeal. Our hopes here may be expressed by the truism, that the more profoundly and the more systematically theology is studied, the more orthodoxy will prevail. Again, from among similar indications, we may

select the encouragement which has been afforded to a knowledge of the original language of the Old Testament:—a knowledge, by the way, which, however much it deserves peculiar encouragement, may soon become too indispensable actually to need it. The pecuniary liberality, and the personal exertions, of men whose names will occur, unmentioned, to our readers, will be productive of wider benefit than the promotion of the cause of Hebrew scholarship. They will impart a stimulus to many collateral acquisitions, and, generally, to depth and comprehensiveness of sacred research.*

We have placed three publications in the front of this article, because they contain sermons preached at those nurseries of our divinity, even more than of our other learning,—the national universities. But, before we proceed to those broad considerations, which the words, Oxford and Cambridge, must suggest, we would despatch our notice of these productions themselves, in the few sentences which we can afford.

Mr. Melvill, here as always, is stirring, fervid, energetic, eloquent. As to the matter of his discourses, the deficiency most observable is a want of spiritual and doctrinal profoundness; as to the manner, an occasional lack of simplicity, calmness, and condensation. Yet passages might be found fraught not merely with glowing imagery, but with simple and admirable force; and certainly Mr. Melvill has, in many portions of this volume, added to the beauty of his style, by somewhat lopping its exuberant and prodigal luxuriance. The following description, which we can extract without violence to the context, is a fair specimen of his present manner: nor the less fair, perhaps, because in its leading idea it reminds us much of Dr. Chalmers; as is the case with a considerable number of other pages, both as to sentiment and expression.

“ We all know what a power there is in memory, when made to array before the guilty days and scenes of comparative innocence. It is with an absolutely crushing might that the remembrance of the years and home of his boyhood will come upon the criminal, when brought to a pause in his career of misdoing, and perhaps about to suffer its penalties. If we knew his early history, and it would bear us out in the attempt, we should make it our business to set before him the scenery of his native village, the cottage where he was born, the school to which he

* In speaking of Hebrew scholarship and collateral acquirements, it is impossible not to specify the translation of three manuscripts, containing the Book of Enoch, by the Archbishop of Cashel; and also a work lately published by the Rev. Edward Murray, vicar of Stinsford, and chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester. Its title is “ *Enoch Restitutus, or an Attempt to separate from the Books of Enoch the Book quoted by St. Jude; also a comparison of the Chronology of Enoch with the Hebrew Computation, and with the Periods mentioned in the Book of Daniel, and in the Apocalypse.*” Rivingtons. 1836.—We hope to take up the subject.

was sent, the Church where he first heard the preached Gospel; and we should call to his recollection the father and the mother, long since gathered to their rest, who made him kneel down night and morning, and who instructed him out of the Bible, and who warned him, even with tears, against evil ways and evil companions. We should remind him how peacefully his days then glided away; with how much of happiness he was blessed in possession, how much of hope in prospect. And he may be now a hardened and desperate man: but we will never believe, that, as his young days were thus passing before him, and the reverend forms of his parents came back from the grave, and the trees that grew round his birth-place waved over him their foliage, and he saw himself once more as he was in early life, when he knew crime but by name, and knew it only to abhor—we will never believe that he could be proof against this mustering of the past—he might be proof against invective, proof against reproach, proof against remonstrance; but when we brought memory to bear upon him, and bade it people itself with all the imagery of youth, we believe that, for the moment at least, the obdurate being would be subdued, and a sudden gush of tears prove that we had opened a long sealed-up fountain.”—pp. 71, 72.

In turning back, we see two sentences immediately preceding this citation, which may demonstrate;—the former of them, how powerfully Mr. Melvill can express a moral truth; the latter, how he can still fritter away the impression by some fanciful appendage, and almost spoil his own work, by overdoing what he had already done well.

“The great evil with the mass of men is, that, so far at least as eternity is concerned, they never think at all—once make them think, and you make them anxious; once make them anxious, and they will labour to be saved. When a man considers his ways, angels may be said to prepare their harps, as knowing that they shall soon have to sweep them in exultation at his repentance.”—p. 71.

The last sermon, as indeed all the rest, conveys some most impressive warnings in the most striking diction. Its subject adheres closely to the text, “*When I consider, I am afraid of Him.*”

“That the fear, or dread, of God is the produce of consideration; that it does not therefore spring from ignorance, or want of thought; this is the general truth asserted by the passage, and which, as accurately distinguishing religion from superstition, demands the best of our attention. It is not to be doubted that a superstitious dread of a Supreme Being is to be overcome by consideration; and it is as little to be doubted that a religious dread is to be produced by consideration. The man who has thrown off all fear of God, is the man in whose thoughts God finds little or no place. If you could fasten, for a while, this man’s mind to the facts, that there is a God, that he takes cognizance of human actions as moral governor of the universe, and that he will hereafter deal with us by the laws of a most rigid retribution, you would produce something like a dread of the Creator; and this dread would be superstitious

or religious, according to the falseness, or soundness, of principles admitted and inferences deduced. If the produced dread were superstitious, it would give way on a due consideration of these principles and inferences; if religious, such consideration would only deepen and strengthen it.

"We are sure that the absence of consideration is the only account which can be given of the absence of a fear of the Almighty. It is not, and it cannot be, by any process of thought, or mental debate, that the great mass of our fellow-men work themselves into a kind of practical atheism. It is by keeping God out of their thoughts, or allowing him nothing more than the homage of a faint and passing remembrance, that they contrive to preserve that surprising indifference, which would almost seem to argue disbelief of his existence. And there is not one in this assembly, whatever may be his unconcern as to his position relatively to his Maker, and whatever his success in banishing from his mind the consequences of a life of misdoing, in regard of whom we have other than a thorough persuasion, that, if we could make him consider, we should also make him fear.

"It is not that men are ignorant of facts; it is that they will not give their attention to facts. They know a vast deal which they do not consider. You cannot be observant of what passes around you, or within yourselves, and fail to perceive how useless is a large amount of knowledge, and that too simply through want of consideration. To borrow the illustration of a distinguished writer, who has so treated as almost to have exhausted this subject, every one knows that he must die; and yet the certainty of death produces no effect on the bulk of mankind. It is a thing known, it is not a thing considered; and therefore those who are sure that they are mortal, live as though sure they were immortal. Every one of you knows that there is a judgment to come. But may we not fear of numbers amongst you, that they do not consider that there is a judgment to come; and may we not ascribe to their not considering what they know, their persisting in conduct which must unavoidably issue in utter condemnation?"—p. 112—114.

So far the language is as correct as it is animated, but towards the conclusion, Mr. Melvill relapses into a vein, which it is time for him to abandon.

"When I muse on the stupendousness of Creation; when I think of countless worlds built out of nothing by the simple word of Jehovah; my conviction is that God must be irresistible, so that the opposing Him is the opposing Omnipotence. But if I cannot withstand God, I may possibly escape Him. Insignificant as I am, an inconsiderable unit on an inconsiderable globe, may I not be overlooked by this irresistible Being, and thus, as it were, be sheltered by my littleness? If I would answer this question, let me consider Creation in its minutest departments. Let me examine the least insect, the animated thing of a day and an atom. How it glows with Deity! How busy has God been with polishing the joints, and feathering the wings, of this almost imperceptible recipient of life! How carefully has he attended to its every want, supplying profusely whatever can gladden its ephemeral existence! Dare I think this tiny insect overlooked by God? Wonder-

ful in its structure, beautiful in its raiment of the purple and the gold and the crimson, surrounded abundantly by all that is adapted to the cravings of its nature, can I fail to regard it as fashioned by the skill, and watched by the Providence of Him who 'meted out Heaven with a span, and measured the waters in the hollow of his hand?' It were as easy to persuade me, when considering, that the archangel, moving in majesty and burning with beauty, is overlooked by God, as that this insect, liveried as it is in splendour and throned in plenty, is unobserved by Him who alone could have formed it.

. "And if the least of animated things be thus subject to the inspections of God, who or what shall escape those inspections and be screened by its insignificance? Till I consider, I may fancy, that occupied with the affairs of an unbounded empire, our Maker can give nothing more than a general attention to the inhabitants of a solitary planet; and that consequently an individual like myself may well hope to escape the severity of His scrutiny. But when I consider, I go from the planet to the atom. I pass from the population of this globe, in the infancy of their immortality, to the breathing particles which must perish in the hour of their birth. And I cannot find that the atom is overlooked. I cannot find that one of its fleeting tenantry is unobserved and uncared for. I consider then; but consideration scatters the idea, that, because I am but the insignificant unit of an insignificant race, 'God will not see, neither will the Holy One of Israel regard.' And thus, by considering the works of creation, I reach the persuasion that nothing can escape God, just as before that nothing can withstand Him. What then will be the feeling which consideration generates in reference to God? I consider God as revealed by creation; and he appears before me with a might which can crush every offender, and with a scrutiny which can detect every offence. Oh then, if it be alike impossible to resist God, and to conceal from God, is he not a being of whom to stand in awe; and shall I not again confess, that, 'when I consider I am afraid of Him?'"—p. 131—133.

Here, there is much more of effort than of originality; and is it not extraordinary, that, before such an audience as he addressed, Mr. Melvill should employ the word "*atom*," with so strange and careless a mode of usage? We really thought, that in its popular, as well as in its philosophical and etymological signification, an "*atom*" meant an indivisible particle of matter; one of the first rudiments or component parts of bodies; something infinitely small; assuredly, much smaller than a man or a butterfly. But here we have "*the fleeting tenantry of an atom*;" "*the animated thing of a day and an atom*:"—a slip or oversight, of which it would be ill-natured to say more.

Mr. Dale's Discourses "on the Probation for the Christian Ministry practically considered," are as a continuation of those, which he delivered in the same place last year. The subject had been almost exhausted; and there is little that is new in the publication now before us. The style is still, for the most part,

upon stilts; and the preacher of March sometimes appears as if he were striving to outshine and outsoar his predecessor of February. This fact is the more to be lamented, because, when he chooses to be simple and natural, few authors of the day can write better than Mr. Dale. The peroration of the third sermon, for instance, is fine and rich in composition, without being overlaboured; and we quote it with the more eagerness, on account of the minister whose awful death it commemorates.

“Christian sympathies are beyond all question of far higher value than mere worldly courtesies. Nor will it be expected that one should be insensible to their value, who has recently assisted in the funeral obsequies of a brother in the ministry*—one who lived with the spirit of the Gospel in his heart, and died with the utterance of it on his lips. We, who attended him to the grave, looked not then upon mere outward trappings of woe—upon a bier followed by unsympathizing mourners, with the cold decencies of a formal aspect, but with hearts unmoved;—we looked upon hundreds, I might say thousands, not only arrayed in the funeral garb, that sometimes masks exultation, and still oftener mocks regret, but dissolved in undissembled grief; all eyes filled with tears—all hearts heavy with sadness—one cry of anguish arising from the thronged and teeming church—from the youthful, ‘Alas, my father!’—from the aged, ‘Alas, my brother!’ The wealth of a thousand kingdoms could not have purchased such a spectacle: hearts are not bought and sold; and I should then have learned, if I had not known before, that sympathies are strongest upon earth, when the tie of brotherhood has been the hope of heaven, and that those love most truly and most warmly ‘who are partakers of like precious faith.’—He of whom I speak was a sure and safe model. He courted not the applause of man: he revolved in no ample orbit, and shed around him no wide-expanding, no conspicuous light: his parish was his family, and his home was his flock. They are about to perpetuate his memory in marble, but his best record is in their hearts. Surely to be thus beloved, thus honoured, thus regretted, thus remembered, on the sole ground of spiritual faithfulness and moral worth, transcends all literary honour, and outshines all worldly fame, while, unlike them, it is within the reach of all. Few can win extended and enduring reputation; but who cannot conciliate love and command esteem? Man, with all his far-gone corruption, has not fallen so low as to have lost all perception of moral excellence. However misconception and misrepresentation may interpose for a season, truth is mighty, and will prevail—fidelity will be appreciated—consistency must be approved. Thus it was with him of whom I spake: those were found, who knew not how they loved till they lost him; and who, having long lightened his labours by their sympathy, paid the last tribute of love when they hallowed his grave with their tears.

“Let us then be stirred up thus to labour and thus to love, if we

* The Rev. Isaac Saunders, M. A., rector of St. Ann's Blackfriars, who expired in the pulpit of his church on New Year's day, 1836, when uttering his text, “Ye are complete in Christ.”

would that such grief should attend our departure, and such hearts record our memory; nay, what is of incalculably higher worth, if we would be saved ourselves, and save them that hear us. For the grave is nothing—the funeral pomp is nothing—the marble monument is nothing—the soul is every thing! And, oh! would it not be the few who are lost, and the many who are saved, if the question were asked by the living, to which the dying too often can find no reply, ‘What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?’ If the blood of Christ was shed for its salvation, what then shall be taken to compensate for its loss? O calculate this, before ye hazard the precious deposit in others, before ye endanger it in yourselves. Rather may ye go hence to do what wisdom counsels, and even what interest would enjoin; to take thought for souls above all beside, because they, and they alone, are the purchase of the ‘blood of Christ!’”—p. 74—77.

What, however, of useful or exact knowledge, can be gained by the following mixture of metaphysics and metaphor?

“Man’s mind is not coloured by circumstances; it is not like a stream which varies the tint of its waters with the substance of the soil through which it flows. It is like a river, turbid indeed, but made so by a sediment that is deposited in the bed of the channel; and which rolls as black and as troubled through verdant plains and smiling pastures, as between the rifted rocks or along the blasted heath. The channel must be cleansed out, if the stream is to be made pure; and so the *χάρισμα* must be imparted for the purifying of the heart, before we can expect to witness the purifying of the life.”—p. 32.

In such passages, truth of the most sacred and momentous character is disguised, if not sacrificed, for the sake of a comparison. To deny too much is as perilous as to attempt to prove too much. And while we can never agree with Mr. Robert Owen, that man is altogether the creature of circumstances, even that error is less remote from the reality, and less fatal to the progress of the species, than the assertion that man’s mind,—whether Mr. Dale means by *mind*, the intellectual or the moral part of his being,—is unaffected, or, as he calls it, *uncoloured* by circumstances.

Mr. Dale seems to have gone to Cambridge as a kind of accredited agent, advocate, and emissary of the *Pastoral Aid Society*:—a society, he tells us in his advertisement,—“of which an account will be found in the appendix to this work,—a society, in the writer’s judgment, equally adapted to the exigencies, and consistent with the discipline, of the Church of England.”—p. iv. Whether it was quite proper or prudent, that the university pulpit should be turned to such a purpose, we may inquire at another moment. Nor can we here pause to consider what Mr. Dale says, about *the necessity of practical ministers*, or “THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM INEFFICIENT.” But it consists with our

present design to transfer to our pages what Mr. Dale calls a "*statement of facts.*"

"Were we describing fictions—were we calling up scenes of imaginary wretchedness—were we grouping images of picturesque horror for the poet's pen or the painter's canvas, we might awaken in our hearers the sympathy of sentiment, and diffuse a pleasing melancholy through the heart, lightly felt, and easily to be forgotten. But we deal in realities—in cold, naked, bitter, stern realities; and if facts cannot penetrate the heart, we will give fiction to the winds. We will speak only what we do know, and testify what we have seen. We have known, and that through the effect of one prolific vice, intemperance—we have known, and we might tell you, of the father and the husband, insensible to the cries of famishing children, and replying but with curses to the prayers of his agonized and outraged wife—we might tell you of the mother, forgetful of her sucking child, and lost to all compassion for the offspring of her womb—of the grey-haired parents, one suffering, one dying, abandoned by their own, their only son, to whom they had given all—of the son, trained by his father's example to live a felon, the daughter, by a mother's connivance, to become that which we will not name; of the noble intellect, that sparkled like a sun among its fellows, going down in thick darkness ere its noon—of the limbs, cast in giant mould, tremulous with premature decay—of the moody maniac, acting unconsciously upon his dying bed the mimicry of the spirit-shop, now, as if raising the glass to his parched lips, now, dashing down the price of the ruin of his soul;—yea, and of the ghastly suicide, first infuriated by jealousy, and then maddened by strong drink, pointing the fatal weapon shattering the brain, yet so far foiled in his aim, that ten days of unutterable agony shall intervene between the deadly act and the departure of the imprisoned soul—who dare ask whither? Such are the scenes which will, occasionally at least, present themselves to a pastor's view. He can only avoid them, in a large city, by neglecting his duty and betraying his trust. If they exist, they should be sought out; but WHY do they exist? It would be falsehood to impeach the premises—it would be folly to resist the conclusion. 'It is *thus* the sheep of Christ perish, because the pastor cannot take heed to ALL the flock.'

"If, then, such are the scenes which ye must occasionally witness, are ye prepared? Will ye be ready, thus summoned, to utter a word of sympathy to the sufferer, of consolation to the mourner, of admonition to the sinner?—And think not that we speak only of one portion of Christ's vineyard; it is to be more than feared, that the metropolis has too many miniatures in all parts of the land; and that in some, it may be, there is an equal depth of darkness, with a less proportion of light, and a similar insolence of profligacy, with a greater comparative inadequacy of the means of grace. Wherever men congregate in numbers, noxious weeds and roots of bitterness will flourish. We must not look, therefore, in this our day and generation, for studious, and abstracted, and contemplative pastors, devoted to pursuits of science, and

emulous of literary fame;—we must not look, exclusively at least, for the eloquence that captivates, for the imagination that transports, for the reasoning that carries all, by the very force of its current to anchor in full conviction. All these, directed to the purposes of the ministry, and consecrated to the upholding and enlargement of the church, are to be admired, valued, loved; but that which is essential to win souls, faithfulness united to diligence, is within the range of ordinary minds. All ministers of Christ cannot aspire to the model of Paul, haranguing the Areopagites at Athens, or Peter, confounding the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem; but who cannot imitate Peter feeding *one by one* the sheep of Christ, as one who has the oversight thereof;—Paul teaching from house to house, and warning every one night and day with tears? The practice of the ministry can alone be the preservative of the flock. It is a fallacy, too current in the present day, to mix up sentiment with religion; to clothe in rich and vivid colouring the duties and the delights, the efforts and the encouragements, the trials and the anticipations of the Christian minister; to paint him smoothing the way to heaven and pointing to the skies, with all the accompaniments of striking scenery and picturesque grouping—the streaming eyes, and uplifted hands—the deep silence, or the whispered penitence, or the murmur of the broken sigh, which is the language of the heart. But romance expires on the threshold of real life, at least in peopled towns and crowded cities—expires in the dwelling of poverty, where there is nothing but desolation around, and nothing but darkness within,—and where, as too frequently happens, a thin partition only interposes between the bed of death and the careless trifler or the reckless drunkard;—and where sounds of revelry or ribaldry disturb the murmured prayer, and shrieks of wild fierce laughter mingle strangely with the groans of the dying. Think ye this an exaggerated picture? My own prayers, at the bedside of a dying man, at an early hour on the Sabbath morning, have been interrupted by the yells and imprecations of a drunkard, who has reeled home from the spirit shop, that he might curse himself to sleep.”—p. 93—97.

So rhetorical a manner of “*stating facts*,” it has seldom been our lot to contemplate: and we must add, that this overstrained style, instead of bearing to our minds the impress of true Christian oratory, rather resembles the scraps of sermons which are now and then inserted in a lady’s novel, where the fair authoress is ambitious of putting into the mouth of a favourite preacher something which she intends to be supereminently awakening.

Mr. Eden’s Sermons are intitled, “The Unity of the Church in her Communion and Ministry.” The author, although we dissent from some of his opinions, quite vindicates, in these discourses, his established character as a scholar and a Christian, and is evidently an able and pious man. His manner, though Mr. Eden, too, is not without his aspirations, is calmer and more doctrinal than Mr. Melvill’s or Mr. Dale’s:—although we regret to acknowledge that we do not see much, which is definite and

precise;—much, which approximates to any clear information, as to what true union is, or how it is to be attained. We subjoin a single but rather a long specimen :

“ With Paul the preacher, ‘ Christ was All :’ not only the *subject-matter*, but the single *subject* ; each and all of the truths he laid down, like rays of heavenly light, emanating from, and converging upon, that one glorious and Divine Person. And it is to this point, especially, that we should have regard ; on this fix our attentive view—if we would comprehend the meaning, and catch, for our own imitation, the spirit of St. Paul’s assertion, that he preached ‘ Christ Jesus the Lord.’ It was not an idea, a notion, a proposition, or even a doctrine (though copious streams of doctrine flowed therefrom) that he primarily preached, but the Word made flesh, and dwelling among men. It was one who had ‘ gone in and out amongst them,’ whom they had heard, and ‘ seen with their eyes, whom they had looked upon, and their hands had handled,’ that this Apostle preached ; a living Being, an incarnate God. And it is this exhibition of the *Person* of Christ, which, from the Apostles’ age to the present has been the foundation of all effective preaching of Him. Upon this foundation indeed will be reared the whole edifice of truth : upon this platform will be constructed an orderly and complete system of evangelical divinity ; but ‘ other *foundation* can no man lay than that is laid which is Christ Jesus ;’ ‘ the Lord from heaven ;’ ‘ Christ Jesus the Lord.’ When this is habitually done—when the ministrations of religion find their centre, and rallying point, in the reality of Christ’s Person, then, all the great doctrines of our faith are intelligently received ; because they are seen, not as abstract propositions, but as lively principles ; as the consequences of that work of Christ, which he wrought out for our sake. Of the ministry which is grounded on this reference of all things to the Person of Christ, his proper Deity will of course be the basis ; for, it is the single ground of the glory of that Person. His infinite perfections as ‘ God, over all, blessed for ever’—equal to the Father, and one with him, are the features which give to the dispensation of the Gospel its unique, its distinguishing excellency. This corner-stone of the future building being firmly set, the whole will rise in grandeur and in strength ; this being unsettled, its solidity and coherence is, at once, destroyed. No labour, therefore, can be deemed superfluous, which is employed in demonstrating this great truth : to impress and reiterate its evidences, will be to make sure work in all subsequent teaching ; for here it is that a germinant scepticism, a covert unbelief, first manifests itself. It is here that under the semblance of an expansive philosophy, infidelity creeps beneath the foundations of our faith ; and having corroded the substance on which it stood, leaves us to perish under its ruins. It is here that Rationalism, (libellously calling itself Reason,) first plants its foot ; and here, therefore, must we repel its entrance : detecting for ourselves, and exposing to the world, the shallowness of its pretensions ; shewing that the Reason which leads men to confess their natural ignorance upon all other subjects, should pre-eminently so act in this ; and that the finite, in receiving the com-

munications of the infinite mind, has reached its limits when it has listened to the divine voice, and understood the sense of that which Prophets and Apostles have affirmed. Its usurpation of a name derived from 'Reason' must not beguile us; because it adopts this name only to hide from itself its full deformity, its unwillingness to allow those principles, which once granted would compel it to admit the consequences which it hates. Here the minute arguments of verbal sophistry must be defied, as well by the influx of separate testimonies from all parts of the Bible, as from the structure of the scheme of salvation. Not Christ as Divine—in some mitigated sense which all can receive—as possessing a secondary and derivative Divinity; but Christ as absolute God; in whom the Divine attributes, though veiled in the flesh, are not limited, but exist in the fulness of their perfection; at once the image of the invisible God, and the model of unfallen man,—is to be preached, as a truth essential to the Gospel scheme, and with which it is so interwoven, that, if it be touched, the whole edifice must crumble into dust. For this alone is the basis of the Atonement; to which,—when the 'exceeding sinfulness of sin' has been discovered to the conscience,—the Deity of Christ at once conducts. When the mind has arrived at the Atonement through this avenue of conviction of sin, there will be no danger of a false view of that great verity of our faith. None will then imagine that the Atonement is a mere drama enacted by God, to restore to man that self-complacency which sin has disturbed within his breast; whilst God has never been his enemy; has no attribute of justice to be appeased; has been his friend and continues such still, however sinful he may have been and may remain; but, (the character of God being unchangeably holy,) that man's iniquities have 'separated between' him and his God; that an example of his own holiness must precede the example of his mercy; that, by being just alone could he be 'the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.' To teach that this reconciliation is, on the part of God, complete: and that no ideas of freeness can equal the freeness with which man is invited to be reconciled to God; that this offer is not only unclogged with conditions, but that its essence is, that it abolishes all conditions; this,—while it will display the effulgent glory of the cross of Christ,—by a law of divine attraction, will kindle a returning love to God; and will thus evidence that the faith which justifies through the merit of Christ's blood, is intimately and certainly linked with that which sanctifies by his Spirit. And so, in exhibiting the Gospel, we shall find ourselves 'preaching Christ Jesus the Lord;' we shall fulfil the test before laid down, of glorifying his Person, not by any mystic abstractions of mind in contemplating that Person apart from the revelations of Him in the Scriptures, but by understanding the grace of Christ in his gift of himself for us; the pardon of sin through this blood, our union with him, and the consequent communications of his grace for the edification of his members.

"In like manner the privileges and prospects of the church will centre in Christ: the holy Catholic church is 'his body:' the communion of saints 'is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ:' the remis-

sion of sins is 'preached among all nations in his name;' the resurrection of the body is the work of the Son, whose voice 'all that are in the graves shall hear and shall come forth:' the earnest of the life everlasting is 'Christ in us the hope of glory.'

"The promises of God have their stability in him; being 'in him yea, and in Him Amen, unto the glory of God by us;' his threatenings are executed by Christ upon 'them that know not God;' while 'to them that are in Christ Jesus' they bring 'no condemnation.'

"The ordinances of religion have their significance from him; for, we are 'buried with Christ in baptism;' and, in the Eucharist, it is 'the Lord's death,' that we show.

"And, the morals of the Gospel, apostolically taught, will equally be 'the preaching of Christ Jesus the Lord.' Duties civil, relative, and personal, if handled by us as by Paul, will not be rigid precepts and isolated laws, but animated principles, because grafted upon Christ, the living vine, receiving nourishment from him, and reflecting, by their vigorous operation, the power of that grace which impels to an unconstrained obedience to his will; and thus in the display of doctrine and the enforcement of obligation, 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God' will be resplendent 'in the face of Jesus Christ.' By no constraint, but necessarily and naturally, in all our ministrations Christ will be seen riding forth 'conquering, and to conquer:' and like as he is destined ultimately to subdue the whole of his creation to his empire, so will he appear in the ministry of those whom he employs as agents to hasten that triumph, subordinating all the departments of his truth to the glory of himself. The life's blood that streams from the cross will thus circulate through the spiritual system, and return to the fountain whence it set out; the light that irradiates the Redeemer's head will thus shoot its rays around, and encompass the whole body of his truth and carry back the eye to the glory whence it issued."—p. 37—46.

Amidst all these quotations we may seem to have lost sight of our general topic—the prospects of English Theology. But, in point of fact, nothing can be more pertinent to our subject, than an exhibition of the Sermons which are now preached to our Universities, and the degree of attention with which they are heard. The touching, yet manly strain, in which Mr. Melvill takes leave of his audience at Cambridge, may instruct us in both points.

"If we were once deprived of the Gospel; if the Bible ceased to circulate amongst our people; if there were no longer the preaching of Christ in our churches; if we were left to set up reason instead of Revelation, to bow the knee to the God of our own imaginations, and to burn unhallowed incense before the idols which the madness of speculation would erect—then farewell, a long farewell, to all that has given dignity to our state, and happiness to our homes; the foundations of true greatness would be all undermined, the bulwarks of real liberty shaken, the springs of peace poisoned, the sources of prosperity dried up; and a coming generation would have to add our name to those of

countries whose national decline has kept pace with their religious, and to point to our fate as exhibiting the awful comprehensiveness of the threat, 'I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent.'

"But we rejoice in pronouncing this a doom, respecting which we do not augur a likelihood that it will fall on this kingdom. There may have been periods in the history of this land, when the upholders of true religion had cause for gloomy forebodings, and for fears that God would unchurch our nation. And some indeed may be disposed to regard the present as a period when such forebodings and fears might be justly entertained. They may think that so great is the array of hostility against the national Church, that the most sanguine can scarce venture to hope that the candlestick will not be cast down. We cannot subscribe to this opinion. We are not indeed blind to the amount of opposition to the national Church; neither have we the least doubt that the destruction of this Church would give a fatal blow to the national Christianity. We dare not indeed say that God might not preserve amongst us a pure Christianity, if the national Church were overthrown. But we are bold to affirm, that hitherto has the Church been the grand engine in effecting such preservation; and that we should have no right to expect, if we dislocated this engine, that results would not follow disastrous to religion. I could not contend for the Established Church, merely because venerable by its antiquity, because hallowed by the solemn processions of noble thought which have issued from its recesses, or because the prayers and praises which many generations have breathed through its services, seem mysteriously to haunt its temples, that they may be echoed by the tongues of the living. But as the great safeguard and propagator of unadulterated Christianity; the defender, by her Articles, of what is sound in doctrine, and, by her constitution, of what is apostolic in government; the represser by the simple majesty of her ritual, of all extravagance, the encourager, by its fervour, of an ardent piety—I can contend for the continuance amongst us of the Establishment, as I would for the continuance of the Gospel; I can deprecate its removal as the removal of our candlestick. It is not then because we are blind to the opposition to the national Church, or fail to identify this Church with the national Christianity, that we share not the fears of those who would now prophesy evil. But we feel that danger is only bringing out the strength of the Church, and that her efficiency has increased as her existence has been menaced. The threatening of our text belongs to the luke-warm and the indolent; its very language proves that it ceases to be applicable, if it have fanned the embers and strung the energies. We believe of an Apostolic Church, that it can die only by suicide; and where are our fears of suicide, when enmity has but produced greater zeal in winning souls to Christ, and hatred been met by increased efforts to disseminate the religion of love?

"We might not have ventured to introduce these observations, in concluding our discourses before this assembly, had we not felt that the Church stands or falls with the Universities of the land, and that the present condition of this University more than warrants our belief that

the candlestick is not about to be removed. It is a gratification not to be expressed, to find, after a few years' absence, what a growing attention there has been to those noblest purposes for which colleges were founded; and how the younger part, more especially, of our body, whence are to be draughted the ministers of our parishes, and the most influential of our laity, have advanced in respect for religion, and attention to its duties. One who has been engaged in other scenes may perhaps better judge the advance than those under whose eye it has proceeded; and if testimony may derive worth from its sincerity, when it cannot from the station of the party who gives it, there will be borne strong witness by him who addresses you, that not only is the fire of genius here cherished, and the lamp of philosophy trimmed; but that here the candle, which God hath lighted for a world sitting in darkness, burns brightly, and that, therefore, though enemies may be fierce, the candlestick is firm.

"But suffer me, my younger brethren, to entreat you that you would think more and more of your solemn responsibility. I cannot compute the amount of influence you may wield over the destinies of the Church and the country. In a few years you will be scattered over the land, occupying different stations, and filling different parts in society. And it is because we hope you will go hence with religion in the heart, that we venture to predict good, and not evil. We entreat you to take heed that you disappoint not the hope, and thus defeat the prediction. We could almost dare to say that you have the majesty, and the christianity, of the empire in your keeping; and we beseech you, therefore, to 'flee youthful lusts,' as you would the plots of treason, and to follow the high biddings of godliness, as you would the trumpet-call of patriotism. Your vices, they must shake the candlestick, which God in His mercy hath planted in this land, and with whose stability he has associated the greatness of the state, and the happiness of its families. But your quiet and earnest piety; your submission to the precepts of the Gospel; your faithful discharge of appointed duties; these will help to give fixedness to the candlestick—and there may come the earthquake of political convulsion, or the onset of infidel assault, but Christianity shall not be overthrown; and we shall therefore still know that 'the Lord of Hosts is with us, that the God of Jacob is our refuge.'"—p. 82—86.

Mr. Melvill's testimony to the growing piety of Cambridge, is strong rather than convincing: for he himself is too eloquent and too celebrated a preacher not to have attracted large congregations at any period. The fact, however, is indisputable, that not merely when such men as Dr. Shuttleworth, or Mr. Hook, or Mr. Girdlestone, or Mr. J. Anderson, have been preaching in the one University; or such men as Mr. Benson, or Mr. Rose, or Mr. J. Blunt, have been preaching at the other; but, in the average case, of persons less distinguished; the attendance, particularly of undergraduates, has been lately much more numerous at St. Mary's, than it was some years ago. One cause of this result—there are, of course, many others, indeed too many for present enu-

meration—is the circumstance, fully demonstrated by the extracts which we have adduced, that the cast of discourses has been of late more exciting and popular, less scholastic and academic, than heretofore. The preachers have been men accustomed to extensive parishes and mixed congregations; and their harangues have been of a character brought more immediately home to the business and bosom of the listener.

Now, this practice, we conceive, to regard it simply in the point of view which bears upon our immediate topic,—if judiciously regulated and arranged—if kept in its due place and proportion with reference to a general system, and not inordinately or exclusively pursued—may be beneficial, in its consequences, to the theology of a land. For theology, while it is the profoundest and most comprehensive, is also the most practical of all sciences. Pastoral experience, we are thoroughly convinced, is indispensable to the maintenance of a good and efficacious divinity; for, otherwise, there will be no searching and accurate insight into the human heart—a knowledge, next to a perfect acquaintance with the Bible, the most useful for a Christian minister, and absolutely necessary even for a due appreciation of the Bible itself. Religion—even the theory of religion—cannot be understood and felt simply amidst the abstractions of solitary research. Erudition and meditation are, of themselves, insufficient to teach it. The intensest devotion of the intellectual faculties, within the rooms of a college, is unable to instil it. Study, even the severest study, is not enough. A knowledge of mankind, even in regard to the truths of religion, is almost more requisite than a knowledge of books. There is—assuredly there is—many an important lesson of theology, which can best be learnt amidst the movements and collisions of thousands collected in society: which, perhaps, can only be gathered from that perpetual commentary on the word of God—that vast school and seminary of experimental wisdom—the living world: struck out from the shock of conflicting interests; elicited by the troubles, the vicissitudes, the reverses, of existence; the frivolities of health, or the murmurs of sickness; the dissipations of vanity and wealth, or the terrible evils incident to penury and neglect: gushing forth amidst the pride of acquirements or the recklessness of ignorance; or flung up from the darkest recesses of the tempted and shaken spirit. It may well be, that German divinity has suffered considerable damage from the comparatively secluded position of a *large portion* of its professors: and we need scarcely say, that the recluse study of a German professor is a very different thing from the mature and experienced leisure of an English Prebendary. That position may be expedient

for prosecuting minute and subtle investigation without disturbance, and throwing light upon some separate point of critical disquisition : but on the general character of a national theology its effects may be most injurious. It may generate the abominable distinction between esoteric and exoteric doctrines : or it may lead to a cold and barren rationalism, which the burning wants of the mass will always repudiate and abjure ; a bare, speculative, negative philosophy of religion, which may be said to carry with it in its inefficiency a demonstration of its falsehood.

But there is at least as much danger on the other side. The tendency of a scholastic or *professorial* divinity, if there be nothing to counteract its evil, is to become not merely dry, sterile, and uninteresting, but, in sober verity, inapplicable to the moral and spiritual exigencies of living men, amidst the crush of action and the tumult of many passions. But the tendency, again, of *popular* divinity, if left without a counterbalancing power, is to become a thing of quite flimsy and superficial texture ; froth without substance ; a bustle and ferment of superstitious enthusiasm ; a mere *ad captandum* appeal to the senses, the imagination, and the feelings of the multitude. If pastoral experience be essential to the general preservation of good theology in a Church, tranquil inquiry and critical erudition are things of still more direct, and palpable, and indispensable necessity. Hence not only the importance of the divinity, maintained and inculcated at our Universities, is unspeakable and incalculable ; for it involves no less than the question whether the waters of sacredness, which are afterwards to be spread throughout the country, shall be wholesome or polluted at the fountain-head : but let us remember, too, that even pastoral energy, without pure theology, may be a positive mischief ; for it may be, like education without religion, a magnificent power misdirected.

On this account, as on others, we have received and read with very high satisfaction the Cambridge Sermons of the Rev. J. J. Blunt. These discourses, although they were delivered before either of the series already noticed, are of more recent publication. Indeed, they have reached us so late, that we are quite unable to give so full an account of them as we could wish, and as they merit. They form a pleasing interchange with the contemporary and companion publications. There is more stuff in them. They belong to the older style, and from the nature of their design possess a value which is more substantial, and will, perhaps, be more durable than the oratorical displays of Messrs. Melvill and Dale. Much more connected and continuous than the Sermons of the former, much more erudite and historical than those of the latter, they supply most useful and judicious

information respecting the institutions, the doctrines, the Liturgies, and the forms of worship of the primitive Church. At the same time, it is doubtful whether Mr. Blunt's plan could by possibility have been adequately executed within the "*iniqua spatia*" to which he was confined; and whether some of his topics could by any mode of treatment have been rendered very impressive from the pulpit. A single specimen may elucidate our meaning. Speaking of the old fathers, of the "*methodical regulations*" which they introduced into the Church, and of the manner in which they exercised their authority, Mr. Blunt says—

"Next they watched with all vigilance against *heresy* and *dissent*; the latter, indeed, in those days being scarcely separable from the other. Nothing can be more striking than the pains they took in this department of their duty. Thus Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, writes to Caricus and Pontius, (a document of the second century, preserved by Eusebius,) warning them against the heresy of Montanus, or the new philosophy, as it was called; and he transmits them not only his own opinion, but that of other bishops, in other parts, which he had been at the trouble to ascertain, to confirm his own. And from the same evidence it may be gathered, that one Sotas, a Bishop of Anchialum, in Thrace, had actually travelled into Phrygia, to observe with his own eyes those novel prophets, as they were named, the Montanists, Phrygia being then their strong hold; and that he came to the conclusion they were persons possessed. A leading object of Ignatius, in his Epistles which he addresses to the several Churches, is to caution them against the two great heresies which had then appeared in the world; the one, that of the *Docetæ*, which went to deny the humanity of Christ, an error which he combats in his Letters to the People of Smyrna and Tralles. The other, that of the *Ebionites*, which went to deny his divinity, an error which he contends against in his Epistles to Polycarp, the Ephesians, the Magnesians, and the Philadelphians. These were the tares that first sprung up, and here were the chief labourers ready at hand to root them out. In process of time heresies multiplied, but still were the spiritual governors of the Church alive to expose and extirpate them; and no stronger proof surely can be afforded of this than the great work of Irenæus, he a bishop, and his book apparently addressed to one of the inferior clergy; the express object of it being to make his friend acquainted with 'the monstrous and deep mysteries,' as he calls them, of the religious speculators of the day, in order that he might again communicate the same to others, and warn them against such 'abysses of folly and blasphemy against Christ.' And truly nothing less than the strongest sense of the duty which his high office laid him under, could have prevailed with him, one may well believe, to unravel the weary web of fanciful visions which these philosophers had weaved for themselves; and the scrutiny to which he submits them, and the diligence with which he replies to them, render that work of Irenæus a conspicuous monument of his patience, and, I must add, a severe trial of our own."—pp. 62—65.

It will be seen that Mr. Blunt's style is peculiar; but brisk-

ness and vividness are the first of his peculiarities. It would be unjust to say, that his investigation is superficial; but from the conditions necessary to his task, it could not but be cursory. He asserts, and, as far as time and room would allow him, he establishes, a complete coincidence between the Patristical creed and the doctrines of the Anglican Church. But the summary, which he gives in his concluding lecture, will explain the matter much better than our observations:—

“ Thus have I brought before you, in as concise a shape as I could, the leading features of the Primitive Church of Christ, as we gather them from those who are usually termed the Fathers of the first two centuries; and I have made it appear, I trust, that it was not the loose society some would seem to think it, without cohesion of parts, or unity of purpose, but that it had its regular *succession of ministers*, (and those of the *three orders*,) whereby the qualification of the teacher to instruct was secured, duly appointed; its *discipline*, whereby heresy and schism were excluded, duly observed; its *forms of worship*, whereby the rash utterance of unadvised lips was guarded against, duly composed; and yet that it was no Church of mere ritual, but that its *doctrines*, whilst conceived in all soberness, were also those which plain people must understand to be the great doctrines of St. Paul: the *corruption* of our nature, though the degree of it is left undetermined; the need of the *Holy Spirit to restore it*, the Holy Spirit communicated as at other times, so mainly at the *Sacraments*; and the *Incarnation, Cross, and Passion* of God’s blessed Son, whereby this and every other good gift from above was worked out and won for us.

“ In all which particulars, the Church of England has no reason to shrink from a comparison with those days. For as I have made my argument tributary to the illustration of our Church as I have proceeded, so would I desire in the end, and upon a general review of my subject, to leave the impression on your minds, more especially in this season of reproach, that our Church is built upon the primitive model, allowance only being made, in common fairness, for such unessential differences as a change of time and circumstance may have dictated. For whatever may be alleged by enthusiasts against the structure and the forms of the Church of England, as restrictive and chilling, they will be found to be no straiter than is necessary to prevent confusion of doctrine and practice, and to secure peace in both; whilst the great evangelical truths of Scripture, no sectary, however ardent, can proclaim more unreservedly and insist on more perseveringly than does she. So that if at any time the preacher, forgetful for a moment of his commission, provide an essay and not a sermon for his flock, the spirit of his Church, as breaking forth in her Homilies, her Articles, her Liturgy, rises up and rebukes him; and thus eventually the pulpit, if for a season it chance to fall under other influence, recovers itself, and is restored to the faithful service of that Gospel, which our reformers made to assert itself in every line that they penned.

“ God grant that we her ministers may be only true to her; act up

to her spirit ; work her theory out ; recommend her to the people by presenting her unto them as it were in a sensible shape, (as the internal evidence of all her services proves it was meant to be,) that she may stand confessed before them in all the beauty of activity and life ; and sure I am, that so doing, we shall be also true to Christ's Church upon earth ; we shall do all things decently and in order ; we shall pray with the understanding and heart ; we shall rest in a sound and settled faith, not be beaten about by every wind of doctrine ; and in our public and private ministrations, in the temple, and in every house, we shall cease not to teach and preach Jesus Christ."—p. 214—218.

On the whole, all they who wish to confirm their attachment to their Church, and their conviction of the purity of its faith, and the soundness of its discipline, will derive instruction, and edification, and delight from this brief volume of Mr. Blunt ; and may be led by it to the serious perusal of other and more elaborate disquisitions. Much learning is strikingly presented to us in the compass of a rapid sketch, by the aid of neat arrangement, and dexterous condensation. And if his Sermons exhibit, in some respects, a remarkable contrast to those of the preachers who immediately succeeded him, this may help to show the wide range of topics which our English pulpits admit, and the elastic, comprehensive, catholic spirit of our English divinity. We regard it, indeed, as a most happy indication, that the same hearers could listen with pious gratification to the notices of Barnabas, Hermas, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Tatianus, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus ; and also to the animating trumpet notes of Mr. Melvill, and the pastoral admonitions of Mr. Dale. And well is it urged by Mr. Blunt in the peroration of his first discourse—

“ It is not because I believe that other and higher matters would not be more fitting from this place ; or that he who stands before learned men, as I now do, is not called upon to urge them, by all the faculties he has, to save their souls alive, even as he would the poorest and most illiterate congregation, that I have chosen, perhaps hazardously, the topic I have opened to day ; but it is because I regard the times such as peculiarly challenge the discussion, and this assembly such as is peculiarly calculated to entertain it ; an assembly the like to which no minister can gather together elsewhere ; the fountain, beyond every other, from which public opinion flows to every part of our island ; and, therefore, offering him the best opportunity of his life to cast in, according to his humble ability, that branch which he thinks may help to sweeten the bitter waters. If I should be the means, by any thing I have said, or shall say, of leading the many future ministers of our Church, whom I see on all sides of me, to ‘ go round about her, and tell the towers thereof, and mark well her bulwarks,’ that they may the better know what they have to defend, where should be their defence, and what weapons they should wield, I shall feel that I have not laboured in vain ; confident as I am from some pastoral experience, that

the flood of Gospel light, which the Church of England is diffusing over this land, to its most secluded nooks, is vastly greater than many even of her friends suppose; and that spots though she may have upon her disk to tarnish her brightness, they are as nothing compared with the darkness which would follow her eclipse. Let us pray that God will forefend that day, and that having appointed such ministers, it will please Him 'to illuminate all bishops, priests, and deacons, with true knowledge and understanding of his word; and that, both by their preaching and living, they may set it forth, and show it accordingly.'—p. 41—43.

We entertain, therefore, high and comfortable hopes. The time, we trust, is at hand when the fervour of pastoral preaching will be associated with that valuable divinity which is embodied, for instance, with few and insignificant exceptions, in the Bampton lectures. Our opinion has ever been, that no system is altogether a mistake in what it says. We mean that men err far more often—save in the desperate cases, when they are mendacious by design—from their omissions, than from their allegations: from putting forth as the whole what is true only as a part. And our attachment is strong to the old orthodoxy of our Church, precisely because we believe that it is the most catholic of theological schemes, and the least exclusive:—preserving the harmony of faith by taking all its ingredients: asserting both the fore-knowledge of God, and the responsible agency of man, without pretending to sound all the depths of that fathomless mystery: fully and freely advocating man's justification by faith, yet advocating also, *for their own sake*, the value and necessity of good works: neither claiming heaven, on the ground of personal merit, nor so distorting truth into Antinomianism as almost to make Christianity itself an indefensible thing.

Our trust is, from the symptoms which are already visible, and from the methods of intellectual and moral discipline which are in progress, that this comprehensive moderation will gain ground. Willingly would we discern every where the traces of some distinctive excellence. *Here* we can admire the child-like docility of evangelical devotion, and the absolute dependence upon the Revelations of Scripture: *there* we can likewise admire the zeal of original inquiry, and the dispassionate exercise of the human understanding. Warm is our gratitude towards men, like Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman, who have kept alive, and re-invigorated among us, the profound study of historical divinity, the veneration for primitive ordinances, and the habit of ancient reverence for Apostolical forms. On the other side, when confined within those legitimate boundaries assigned by reason herself, we can perceive great use in the bold broad spirit of frank and fearless scrutiny, which is characteristic of Dr. Whately and his friends. We are not afraid of it;—why should we be?—we

are sure that its eventual effect will be to establish, on yet securer foundations, the principles of English orthodoxy. We are sure, too, that there is no repugnance or incompatibility between candour in investigation, and caution in decision.

Let it be borne in mind, that there is no compromise of truth in avoiding narrowness of conception. On the contrary, whatever is narrow and partial, must, we repeat, in itself, under one aspect, be erroneous, and will be the prolific parent of a whole tribe and family of errors. The materials of a complete theology are now at hand among us, if we can but have them rightly mixed. The one thing needful is their union. It is their union which will consummate the accomplishments of the preacher and the divine; not laying the entire stress upon scholarship, nor yet willing to sacrifice the sobrieties of learning even to the energy of pastoral ministrations. If men will but exercise a little mutual forbearance, and put a charitable construction upon each other's tenets and behaviour; if they can but be induced to think that the truth is to be found in the combination of their systems, and not in the exclusive and angry assertion of any one of them, all will be well. Oh, soon may we behold the glorious spectacle, not of an eclectic school, but of an united, unexclusive, comprehensive Church, blending the ardour of some, with the steadiness of others; mingling the resolute defence of the essential features of Protestantism with a wise and just regard to catholic antiquity; defending the truth, defending every part of the truth; retaining the sameness of a theology, sound, holy, reasonable, scriptural, amidst all the diversities of taste, talent, intellectual constitution and physical power; so that "wisdom may be justified in all her children;" so that "all things may work together for good to them that love God,"—so that fresh oil may be poured into all the lamps and vessels of our religion, until its whole temple shall beam with the effulgence of sanctity, and be filled with the glory of the Lord!

ART. VI.—1. *A Commentary on the Order for the Burial of the Dead, &c.* By the Rev. W. Greswell, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and Curate of Disley, Cheshire. 2 vols. Oxford: Parker. London: Rivingtons. 1836.

2. *Sir Thomas Browne's Works, including his Life and Correspondence.* Edited by Simon Wilkin, F.L.S. 4 vols. London: Pickering. 1836. (*The Hydriotaphia, or Urn Burial, and the Brampton Urns*, in vol. 3, pp. 449—505.)

SPEAKING of the death and burial of the righteous, it is observed by the great and good Joseph Hall, sometime Bishop of Exeter

and Norwich, that "though the carcase be insensible of any position, yet honest sepulture is a blessing. It is fit the body should be duly respected on earth, whose soul is glorious in heaven." And again, in his Occasional Meditations—upon the sight of a grave digged up—though he calls the earth a great devourer, he calls it a great preserver too, adding,—

"How safely doth it keep our bodies for the resurrection; we are here but laid up for custody; balms and cere-cloathes, and leads, cannot do so much as this lap of our common mother; when all these are dissolved into her dust, (as being unable to keep themselves from corruption,) she receives and restores her charge. I can no more withhold my body from the earth, than the earth can withhold it from my Maker. O God, this is thy cabinet or shrine, wherein thou pleasest to lay up the precious relics of thy dear saints, until the jubilee of glory; with what confidence should I commit myself to this sure reposition, whiles I know thy word just, thy power infinite?"

The good, and therefore great bishop, from whose works the above words are taken, was one whose spirit was quite in unity with that of the excellent compilers of our Apostolic, and we do not fear to say unrivalled, Liturgy. And it is very meet and right that those bodies, which, when alive, were the tabernacles of an immortal spirit,—and, if the bodies of Christians indeed, were not only such, but were sanctified also by the presence and inhabitation of God's holy spirit,—it is very meet and right, we say, that such tabernacles, when taken down, should be carefully committed to the dust out of which they were formed, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life." And such has ever been the conviction of Christians. From the first establishment of Christianity till the present time, earth has been decently and in order committed to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust. Nor has this been the case only under the Christian dispensation; but from the earliest times, in all countries, and among almost all people, the shell of the body has never willingly been cast forth *with the burial of an ass*. Let the exception prove the rule:—and for what else we would say, let the lines following from Wordsworth speak *that*—a poet who has drunk deep of the spirit of his Bible, and has sent forth its truth to the world, as occasion called, in a pure stream of "English undefiled."

" ' And whence that tribute? wherefore these regards?

Not from the naked *heart* alone of man,
(Though claiming high distinction upon earth
As the sole spring and fountain-head of tears,
His own peculiar utterance for distress
Or gladness.) No, ' the philosophic priest
Continued, ' 'tis not in the vital seat
Of feeling to produce them, without aid

From the pure soul—the soul sublime and pure ;
 With her two faculties of eye and ear,
 The one by which a creature, whom his sins
 Have rendered prone, can upward look to heaven ;
 The other that empowers him to perceive
 The voice of Deity, on height and plain
 Whispering those truths in stillness which the Word,
 To the four quarters of the winds, proclaims.
 Not without such assistance could the use
 Of these benign observances prevail.
 Thus are they born, thus fostered, and maintained ;
 And by the care prospective of our wise
 Forefathers, who, to guard against the shocks,
 The fluctuation and decay of things,
 Embodied and established these high truths
 In solemn institutions.' ”*

Well, indeed, may we thank our wise forefathers for their prospective care! Well may we thank the ancient worthies of our Church, who have taken thought (under God's blessing, from whom all holy thoughts do come) to provide us with that solemn, and affecting, and comforting service—THE ORDER FOR THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD; a service in which our mother Church—holy in all her Offices, and apostolic in all her Prayers—would seem even to have outdone herself—for we may surely say, if the whole Liturgy is *beautiful*, this part of it is “ *beautiful exceedingly*.” And if

—— “ apt words have power to swage
 The tumours of a troubled mind,
 And are as balm to fester'd wounds,”†

after words than those which compose this Office were never put together. Indeed, we ourselves quite subscribe to the full and unreserved eulogy of Southey, who says, in his *Life of Wesley*, that the Burial Service is “ the finest and most affecting ritual that ever was composed—a service that finds its way to the heart when the heart stands most in need of such consolation, and is open to receive it.”‡

* See The Excursion, book v. “ The Pastor.” It were hardly necessary to refer our readers to the two next books, containing, “ The Churchyard among the Mountains.”

† Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, v. 184.

‡ See *Life of Wesley*, vol. ii. p. 249. The incident which follows we give in a note. It is much too valuable to be omitted in these times.

“ It was immediately after the happy restoration of King *Charles the Second*, when together with the rights of the crown, and the *English liberties*, the Church and the Liturgy were also newly restored, that a noted ringleader of schism in the former times was to be buried in one of the principal churches of *London*. The minister of the parish, being a wise and regular Conformist, and he was afterwards an eminent bishop in our Church, well knew how averse the friends and relations of the deceased had always been to the *Common Prayer*, which, by hearing it so often called a *low ru-*

With these impressions in our minds—and, as we trust, in our hearts also, for we are continually called in our ministry to the brink of the grave—we need hardly say that we were glad when we saw advertised, *A Commentary on the Order for the Burial of the Dead, considered as a Manual of Doctrine and Consolation to Christians*. We sent for it—we read it—we were pleased with it—and now we are about to review it. Nor can we doubt for a moment but what Mr. Greswell says in his Address to the Reader is the fact.

“The author has laboured, too, in the due prosecution of his subject, to communicate, if possible, additional point and force to the pathetic allusions of the service; and to place, in a still clearer and more impassive aspect, the truth and propriety of those many confessions of the sinfulness, the misery, the brevity, the transitoriness of human existence, which could scarcely fail to occur in a service like this. To do justice to this part of his subject, he has felt it incumbent upon him to dip his own pen in tears; and to impart to the tone of his commentary, and to the flow and tenor of his reflections, a spirit and character of sadness corresponding to that of the original.”—pp. vi. vii.

Altogether the work is a very good one. It is, as it describes itself in the title-page, a Manual both of Doctrine and Consolation. And if there are certain passages (some might call them rhapsodies) in which the language may appear somewhat too harrowing and passionate—let that be set down as in accordance with the above extract—let Mr. Greswell be considered as a “painful minister” of God’s Word, feeling deeply every syllable which he reads over a brother’s or a sister’s grave. Let him be looked upon as one himself endeavouring to die daily, like St. Paul

diment, a beggarly element, and carnal ordinance, they were brought to contemn to that degree, that they shunned all occasions of being acquainted with it.

“Wherefore, in order to the interment of their friend, in some sort, to their satisfaction, yet so as not to betray his own trust, he used this honest method to undeceive them. Before the day appointed for the funeral, he was at the pains to learn the whole Office of Burial by heart. And then, the time being come, there being a great concourse of men of the same fanatical principles, when the company heard all delivered by him without book, with a free readiness, and profound gravity, and unaffected composure of voice, looks and gestures, and a very powerful emphasis in every part; as indeed his talent was excellent that way; they were strangely surprised and affected. Professing, they had never heard a more suitable exhortation, or a more edifying exercise, even from the very best and most precious men of their own persuasion.

“But they were afterwards much more surprised and confounded, when the same person who had officiated, assured the principal men among them that not one period of all he had spoken was his own; and convinced them, by ocular demonstration, how all was taken, word for word, out of the very Office ordained for that purpose, in the poor contemptible Book of *Common Prayer*.

“Whence he most reasonably inferred how much their ill-grounded prejudice, and mistaken zeal, had deluded them, that they should admire the same discourse, when they thought it an unprepared, unpremeditated rapture, which they would have abominated, had they known it to be only a set form prescribed by authority.”—*Extract from a Sermon by Bishop Spratt, printed at his Visitation in 1695.*

—as one endeavouring to impress upon the living that this Holy Office is intended as well for their comfort, as for their instruction in righteousness—and in that case, none need wonder that he should describe sin as exceeding sinful, and the end of the righteous as exceeding blessed. At such a time, who need wonder that his heart was big* within him, and that words, powerful as they are in the hand of a ready writer, should, in comparison with the matter in hand, nevertheless appear powerless and paralytic? Be this, however, as it may;—if his thoughts burn, and his words are all a-fire—there is no harm in them—they are all sound doctrine. A child would say (a Christian child, we mean, who knew how to keep himself from idols)—The writer has been to the grave to weep there—he is a man, at least, of godly sincerity!

Thus much as concerns the only possible point to be objected to in these volumes; and when said by us, who hold the wildfire of pretended illuminations in abhorrence, it certainly should not withdraw from the value of the work. But it is not our purpose to dismiss it hastily—but to consider it according to the division of the author. We will therefore proceed to its several chapters, remarking, by the way, that Mr. Greswell is not only a *godly* but a *learned* minister of God's word, as may be seen from the whole of this Treatise, and more particularly from the notes and illustrations appended to the second volume.—(p. 251—353.)

The first chapter is on the propriety of funeral usages generally, and on the motives which make it incumbent on Christians to honour the remains of the dead;—and on this we have scarce any thing to remark, as it has been anticipated in what has been said above. As concerns the Jews, we know from our Bibles that they were particular in the observation of decent funeral rites, in-somuch that the lack of them “is recognized by the inspired word of God itself as an aggravation of evil and misfortune, which a contrary treatment would so far have assuaged and prevented.” For example, as concerned Jehoiakim, king of Judah, it is said of God, by his prophet Jeremiah, “They shall not lament for him, saying, Ah, my brother! or, Ah, sister! they shall not lament for him, saying, Ah, Lord! or, Ah, his glory! He shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem.”† Whereas, concerning Abijah, the son of Jero-

* Lest our readers should mistake us, we will illustrate what is here said by a remark of the late excellent Bishop Jebb's.—“I don't know whether you have experienced the same kind of sensation; but, whenever I hear any trait of that kind which you have read to me, I feel my heart swell, as if I could not keep it down; I can describe it only as a swelling of the heart which affects my breathing.”—*Life by Foster*, vol. i. p. 353. Kindred spirit to that of the apostolic Bishop Wilson,—thou art gone to thy rest! *Though dead, he yet speaketh!*

† Jer. xxii. 18, 19.; Cf. ch. xxxvi.

boam, it is said that he was "to come to the grave." And why? "Because in him there was found some good thing toward the Lord God of Israel in the house of Jeroboam."* But, on this point, what need is there to say more?—for the Lord Jehovah, as it is written in the Book of Deuteronomy, took the matter into his own hands. "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."† As for Christians,—from the time that the Lord made his sepulchre with the rich, and Joseph of Arimathea was an instrument in the hands of Him "by whom all things were made,"—from that time to this, in the midst as well of perils and persecutions as of peace and quietness—*sunt illis sua funera*—they have regularly and devoutly committed to the earth the ruins of these earthly tabernacles, and in so doing they have done that which it was their duty to do—neither will he do much amiss who shall say of each one so doing in the words of Naomi, concerning Boaz, "Blessed be he of the Lord, who hath not left off his kindness to the living and to the dead."‡ For, to quote the words of Mr. Greswell, "it is one of the doctrines of the Gospel, that the bodies of Christians, provided they are Christians indeed, and not in name only, besides being tabernacles of an immortal spirit, are likewise sanctified by the presence and inhabitation of God's Holy Spirit. And, as they have thus been honoured during life, it is only fit and becoming that such marks of reverence and respect, as suit the worth and dignity of their former occupant, should be paid them after death. Let the reader believe me, when we consign to the clay-cold ground the remains of a truly good Christian, it is not ordinary dust that we deposit there: on the contrary, it is the material fabric of that temple, within which the Holy Spirit of God dwelt through life. Christian graves of the character were produced in the soul, which lodged there, far more precious in the sight of God than jewels of gold and jewels of silver; graces which may well be conceived to have communicated a corresponding value and sanctity to the body, within which, as its spiritual attributes, they resided. Such, then, being the doctrine which Christianity teaches, respecting the sanctification of these our living bodies, to deny them funeral honours after death, not to treat them with even more tenderness and regard, for the sake of what they have been, would be to desecrate and profane the temples of the living God."§—pp. 8, 9.

The second chapter relates to the "disposal of the body by interment, and to the funeral ceremonies of the Greeks and Romans." It is here shown that interment is most in unison with

* 1 Kings, xiv. 13.

† Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6.

‡ Ruth, ch. ii. 30.

§ See the like sentiments in the excellent and striking sermon of Bishop Hall on Gen. xxiii. 19, 20; Works, vol. iii. p. 97, ed. fol. 1662. Also Sir Thomas Browne's *Hydriotaphia*, c. iv.; vol. iii. p. 481, of Wilkin's edition, presently to be noticed.

the Scripture account of the creation of man, and with the sentence pronounced after the Fall,—“In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” This accordingly was the way adopted by the Jews, and from them by the Christians. And Mr. Greswell has not thought it beneath his subject to observe, that animals have a care for the decent disposal of their dead;—and that when *in articulo mortis* “wild animals will frequently seek out for themselves some cavity of the earth, which may serve both as a retreat, wherein to expire in peace, and as a resting-place for their bones after death; as if instinct taught even them, that thus to disappear betimes from the earth’s surface, and to provide beforehand for the removal of their lifeless remains from view and observation, by secreting and burying themselves, whilst still alive, in hollows and recesses, was the precaution which nature had dictated, for the disposal of themselves before death, with a view to their security after it.” We have mentioned this from some curious facts which have come under our own observation, but which we are sorry we have not space to insert. Though, however, this was the earliest, and the most natural mode of sepulture, our knowledge of antiquity will teach us that in very early times it was departed from, and that “the method in use among the Greeks from the earliest times, and subsequently adopted by the Romans,—the method which prevailed in almost every community of the ancient world at the period of the birth of our Saviour, except the Jewish,—was the method of burning, or disposing of the dead body by fire.” This leads our author to make a few remarks on the ceremonies used on those occasions, on their monuments, and on the honour and respect shown to what was once “instinct with life,” and on their sepulchral urns. For further matter on these points, we beg to refer our readers to the *Hydriotaphia*,* or, *Urn Burial* of Sir Thomas Browne;—one of the many and curious (not to say elegant) works of that erudite and Christian philosopher. Every lover of the literature of his country must be heartily obliged to Mr. Wilkin for the complete edition of his works just published. But of Sir T. Browne and of this edition in particular we purpose to speak a few words in conclusion. To return for the present to Mr. Greswell.

* We refer the scholar to the Laws of the XII. Tables. See Tab. X. *De jure sacro*; and for a fund of information to the Ed. *Joh. Nicolao Funccio, Marburgensi, 1744*. Sophocles has nothing more beautiful than the impassioned address of Electra, on receiving the urn which contained the ashes (as she supposed) of her dead brother Orestes; E. v. 1126.

Ὁ φιλότατος μνημείον ἀνθρώπων ἐμοί,
ψυχῆς Ὀρέστου λοιπὸν, καὶ τ. ἑ.

The third chapter is altogether most interesting, and is full of information,—perhaps fuller than any other chapter in the two volumes. It is “On the appropriation of peculiar localities for the reception of the dead; and on the burial places of the Jews, the Romans, the Greeks, and the Christians respectively.” Our space will not allow us to follow Mr. Greswell throughout, nor are we called upon in a mere review to dwell upon the customs of the Greeks and Romans, though such a consideration falls in very well with the scope of the work before us. What, therefore, we shall say on this head will be, as it were, incidentally, referring our readers to the work itself for fuller information.

And here there is to be observed a broad distinction between the burial-places of Christians when contrasted with those, whether of the Jews, the Greeks, or the Romans, and this is, “that whereas the former have made their cemeteries contiguous to the places of their public worship, the latter never did so.”

“The reason of this distinction,” says Mr. Greswell, “among other things, would appear to be principally this; viz. the supposed defilement and uncleanness communicated by the contact or vicinity of dead bodies; the idea of which, whether derived to the Gentiles from the Jews, or the result of an instinctive horror and superstition, which seems natural to the human mind in thinking upon or contemplating death, prevailed among the Gentiles as much as the Jews. By Jew and Gentile alike, a person polluted, through the contact or proximity of a dead body, while the period of such contamination lasted, was conceived to be disqualified for the acceptable worship of that being, or those beings, whom after a stated manner, and with the performance of stated rites, they severally professed to honour.”—p. 39.

As concerns the Jews, the first account (and it is the first account in history, either sacred or profane) of the appropriation of a particular spot of ground for the express purpose of the burial of the dead, is that cave of Machpelah, the purchase of which Abraham is said to have made, in Gen. c. xxiii. *The field, and the cave that is therein, were made sure unto Abraham for a possession of a burying place by the sons of Heth.* “The only purchase,” says Hall, “that we ever find Abraham made; he would be a stranger here below, and neglecting all other assurances, takes only order for graves; those he thinks are the houses he must trust to,”—inasmuch as the grave and gate of death must be passed in the way to heaven. Now the cave at Machpelah we know was an isolated and retired spot. And so again, in later times, we read of the valley of Jehosaphat, on the east of Jerusalem, as the general burying-place in the neighbourhood of that great city,—a valley, in the words of Ezekiel, *which was full of*

*bones,—and, behold, there were very many in the open valley; and, lo, they were very dry.** Through this valley ran the brook Kidron, and it would appear from Jeremiah that *all the fields unto the brook of Kidron* was but another name for the valley of Jehosaphat, and within it was included the valley of Hinnom, and *Tophet ordained of old*. But, not only from these passages, but from numerous others, relating as well to Jerusalem as other cities, we find that the place of burial for the Jews, (with the single exception of their kings,) lay *without the gate*, and not in the vicinity of the temple, or synagogues. And, that it continued to be so in later times, we know from the burial of our blessed Lord;—from the *potter's field* that was bought to bury strangers in, with the price of blood;—from the account of the corpse of the widow's son which our Saviour met at the gate of Nain (τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, Luke, vii. 12);—from the raising of Lazarus;—from the bodies of the saints which slept going *into* the holy city, and appearing unto many;—and from numerous other instances which we need not recount.

Concerning the Greeks and the Romans we shall only say that they also scrupulously avoided burying within the walls. The sides of their ways, especially on the entrance to their cities, were lined with the tombs and the busts of their dead; but the cities themselves were, as they thought, to be kept pure from such a pollution. As to the Greeks we know from Pausanias that the wayside from the Piræus to Athens was occupied by many tombs of the illustrious dead;—and it is natural to conclude that the burying-places of others were there also, or on the sides of other ways. The Ceramicus† also,—the burial place for those who fell in battle,—was itself too exterior to the city. It is needless to say a word of the Romans, as the “*Siste Viator*,” (so in the Greek ὁδότης,) must be familiar to all. We conclude, therefore, our allusions to them with the following law from the tenth Table. HEMONEM. MORTVOM. EVDO. VRBED. NEI. SEPELITOD. NEIVE. VRITOD.‡

Having seen, then, to use the words of Hall, “that it was the ancientest and best way that sepultures should be without the gates of the city,” both among the Jews, the Greeks, and the

* See Ezek. xxxvii. 1, 2; Jer. xxxi. 40.

† The reader of Aristophanes will not fail to call to mind Pisthetærus' hope to be buried in the Ceramicus—*Westminster Abbey*, as we might say. Nor will the reader of Thucydides forget the oration of Pericles over those who died in the first summer of the war.—Lib. ii. c. 35—46. The words of Aristophanes are,

Ὁ Κεραμεικὸς δίδεται τῷ.

δημόσια γὰρ ἵνα ταφώμην, κ. τ. λ. v. 395.

‡ I. e. Cadaverum in urbe sepultura, vel ustio nulla esto. Cf. Funcc. ut supra, p. 411; Lex iii.

Romans,—moreover that it was made a matter of legal enactment; we shall naturally be led to conclude, that in the earlier times of Christianity, the Christians' burial-places were without the city also. And exactly so we find it to be,—as may be collected from many passages in the early Fathers, and as the reader will see in Mr. Greswell's work, and more fully in Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*,* a book which no Clergyman, who can afford it, should be without. It will appear then to any one who shall make the inquiry, that the Christians were extremely careful of the burial of their departed brethren, and that their tombs were to be found on the road sides of their several cities, and the catacombs, or the subterranean dormitories mentioned by St. Jerome in the neighbourhood of Rome, are still visited by the modern traveller. Such were the early graves of the disciples of Jesus Christ;—or, if not on the wayside, some sequestered spot was chosen as a repository for dust and ashes, and the dead were not forgotten, especially if they had been martyrs and confessors, who rejoiced to lay down their lives for the Gospel's sake. So far indeed were they from being forgotten, that the very place became sacred, and of the funeral harangues,—the first funeral sermons,—which are delivered down to us in the works of the early Fathers, “many of them were pronounced at the sepulchres of their sons who had laid down their lives in defence of the common faith.” Nor did they *only* pronounce their funeral harangues here, but in process of time, as the Gospel went forth conquering and to conquer, on these very spots they built their churches, and, as Bingham observes, “the first step towards burying in churches, was the building of churches over the graves of the martyrs in the country, or else translating their relics into the city churches.” To quote the words of Mr. Greswell,—

“It is, then, in the still extant orations of this description, that the allusions are most frequent to those receptacles, in which the early Christians deposited the deceased professors of their faith. Chrysostom speaks of them as *θῆκαι μαρτύρων*; *memoriæ martyrum* is the name which Augustine gives them. They are elsewhere called the *κοιμητήρια*, or *sepulchra martyrum*. *Basilicæ martyrum* is the name not unfrequently given to them, when, as was afterwards the case, chapels or oratories were erected upon the same spots, over their remains. In Tertullian the name of *arcæ* is often given to these resting-places of the Christian dead; as *cryptæ* is the term which, for a similar purpose, occurred in the writings of Jerome.

* Book xxiii. is devoted to the subject “Of Funeral Rites, or the Custom and Manner of Burying the Dead, observed in the Ancient Church.” The reader is also referred to the poems of the Christian poet Prudentius,—especially the *Περὶ τῶν νεκρῶν*, of which Mr. Greswell has made good use.

“ But by whatever name characterized in the remains of ecclesiastical antiquity, it was on the spots and in the places thus designated, and in repeated instances consecrated by the remains of the martyrs, that the early Christians buried their dead ; not only such as had finished their course by martyrdom, but such as had died a natural death. Here they were deposited with that affectionate care and concern with which it was ever usual among Christians to inter the remains of their fellow believers : whether possessing an additional claim upon their sympathies, as those who had suffered for the faith's sake, or not.”—p. 86.

Thus we see that at the first the early Christians followed the example both of the Jews, and of the Greeks, and Romans, and were buried without the gate ;—and also, *how* in process of time, and *for what cause*, they came to change this order, and to be buried not only in the neighbourhood of their places of worship any where, but even *within* the city where they dwelt. It will not suit the space allotted to us in these pages, to follow up at length the various particulars as to the general establishment of churchyards, and, particularly, as to the establishment of them in this country. Suffice it to say that the first person buried, not *in* the church, but in the *Atrium* or *Church-Porch*,* was Constantine, concerning which privilege, his son Constantius is reported by St. Chrysostom to have said, that he thought he did him great honour to bury him in the Fisherman's Porch. It was not till the sixth century that the *people* began to be admitted, under certain cases, to be buried (according to the words of the Council of Braga, A. D. 563,) *de foris circa murum basilicæ*, i. e. without the walls of the church,—not *in* the church, nor, as we understand it, even *in* the *atrium*, but in the *churchyard*. And this the learned Bingham looks upon as the “ first authentic evidence of a churchyard, or ground in the neighbourhood of a church, intended or permitted for any such purpose as that of sepulture.” But it does not appear that the *general* introduction of churchyards throughout Christendom, that is, of enclosed spaces, adjoining to the churches, and consecrated by the prayers of the Bishop, as the appointed receptacle of the dead, according to the opinions of the learned in ecclesiastical antiquities, bears date earlier than from the end of the ninth, or the beginning of the tenth century. It would appear that consecrated churchyards became general in England “ from the time of Cuthbert,† arch-

* Of the Church at Constantinople, which Constantine had himself erected, and dedicated to the twelve Apostles.

† Sir Thomas Browne's words are, “ The sensible rhetorick of the dead, to exemplarity of good life, first admitted the bones of pious men and martyrs within church walls, which in succeeding ages crept into promiscuous practice : while Constantine was peculiarly favoured to be admitted into the church-porch ; and the first thus buried in England was in the days of Cuthred.” *Hydriotaphia*, c. iii. There are several

bishop of Canterbury, about the middle of the eighth century. Godwin," adds Mr. Greswell, "who has written the life of that prelate, informs us, that he came into Britain, both with a commission to regulate the affairs of the Anglican Church, in other respects, and with a general bull or license to consecrate yards for the interment of the dead, in the immediate neighbourhood of churches, whether these were situated in the towns or in the country."—p. 92. With regard to the burial of Emperors and other eminent persons *within* the Church, there is some difficulty to ascertain the date when it began. Justinian in his new code, dropping, says Bingham, the former part of Theodosius's Law, which obliged all people to bury without the city, still retains the latter clause, which forbids men to be buried in the seats of the Martyrs and Apostles. The same prohibition we find also in the Council of Nantes, A. D. 658. But between that date and A. D. 813, when the Council of Mentz was held, certain limitations and exceptions were made in favour of great and eminent persons. The words of the Council are, *Nullus mortuus intra ecclesiam sepeliatur, nisi Episcopi, aut Abbates, aut digni Presbyteri, aut fideles Laici*.* However, it is clear from ecclesiastical history that, before this, Bishops and Emperors were buried within the Church, as may be seen in Bingham, book xxiii. c. i. § 8, who adds that after this time the matter was left to the discretion of the Bishops and Presbyters, as to who should, or who should not, be buried in Churches,—and that as to hereditary sepulchres they were not allowed in the ninth century, but were brought in by the Pope's Decretals.† Bingham dates this from about A. D. 1230.

We have thought that the above succinct account might be acceptable to many of our readers;—the substance of it will be found in Mr. Greswell's pages; but, in our capacity of critics, we have taken care to examine what he has said by means of the books which are around us,—“our silent friends.” We would now, before we proceed to enumerate the chapters following of the work before us, make a remark or two as to the present mode of sepulture amongst us.

In the first place, then, with such an office as our Burial Service before us, dust cannot be committed to dust but decently

passages which lead us to think that Mr. Greswell could not be ignorant of this remarkable treatise, and yet we do not recollect that he has ever referred to it.

* See Bingham, in loc., who states also that at the Council of Winchester under Lanfrank, Archbishop of Canterbury, A. D. 1076, the clause following was agreed to: “*In Ecclesiis corpora defunctorum non sepeliantur.*”

† We have not space to dwell upon either the avarice of ecclesiastics in general, or in particular on that of the Roman Catholic Church,—though from the mention of the Decretals, full scope is offered for such consideration.

and in order. We should, however, greatly rejoice to find that better accommodations (if we may with sobriety use the expression) were found for the silent tomb. In our great cities we fear,—we know,—it is far otherwise; and although somewhat has of late been done for the enlarging of our churchyards, still, in London especially, the burial grounds are incapacitated to receive those departed this life. And it is for this reason that we could heartily wish to find sacred ground “*without the gate*” bought by parishes and set apart for this very thing, as in the days of the early Christians, and in the old time before them. Those who have seen only the churchyards, or more properly, the burial-grounds, in foreign countries, have been delighted with their seclusion, (“*without the gate*,”) and with the care which is taken to preserve them from desecration. We who have officiated at many funerals in a foreign land, and have followed our brethren and our sisters *there* to the house appointed for all living, have thought upon such quiet resting-places with an inward joy which we should have been sorry not to have felt. Our own solemn service at such a time seemed doubly impressive,—whether in summer, when all was green and beautiful, and decked with flowers around us,—or in the dreary winter of the north, when the sleet and the snow was twisted by the wind about our bare heads. Nay, more, when we have attended the funerals of others, not our own countrymen, and have sadly missed the comforting words of “The Order for the Burial of the Dead,” and have heard in the place of it a mere harangue, we still could not but be alive to the beauty even of a funeral scene, and to the care taken that the receptacles for the dead should show that the dead lived in the hearts of the survivors.* Again we repeat that we shall be glad to find a space devoted *by the proper authorities* without *all* our towns as a burial-place for our dead. Sooner or later it must come to pass generally; we rejoice that in some places such a *decent innovation*, or, rather, *such a returning to the old paths*, is already in being.

Another point on which we would hazard a remark is on the burial within our churches—a custom we, in general, could willingly see dispensed with, as it renders them unwholesome, and greatly adds to the *crowd* (if we may so say) of a crowded congregation. In former days we see that it was not permitted. Would that it were not so now!—and that all men thought with the good St. Swithin, “who gave charge when he died, that his body should not be laid within the church, but where the drops of rain might wet his grave, and where passengers might walk over it.” “But,” says

* In Denmark a trifling sum is paid annually to the curator of the burial-ground (*Kirke-gaard*), to see that the graves of those “*gone before*” be not forgotten. “*Han er ikke død, Men gaaet forud!*”

Hall, "to speak freely what I think concerning this so common practice, I must needs say I cannot but hold it very unfit and inconvenient, both, first, in respect of the majesty of the place; it is (*κυριακή*), the Lord's house; it is (*βασιλική*), the palace of the King of Heaven; and what prince would have his court made a charnel-house?" And with these sentiments the good and apostolic bishop died; and honest Fuller, in his "Worthies of England," has justly inserted the passage following from his will, at the end of his remarks. "*In the name of God, Amen. I, Joseph Hall, D. D., not worthy to be called the Bishop of Norwich, &c. First, I bequeath my soul, &c.; my body I leave to be interred, without any funeral pomp, at the discretion of my executors, with this only monition, that I do not hold God's house a meet repository for the dead bodies of the greatest saints.*"*

But to proceed. Chapter the fourth is on "the Passing-Bell," and it is a beautiful chapter, on which we could gladly say much,—*sed non erat his locus*,—and perhaps *the party* might call us Papists, as they have all but done the excellent Mr. Newman, for his Primitive Sermons. However, we will venture to say thus much,—that, without doubt, we have let go too many of the harmless customs of the olden time, and by stripping off the ancient trappings and ceremonies of devotion,† we have left a cold-hearted set of innovators to rejoice at the cessation of those solemn, though oftentimes superstitious rites, which add many a convert to the Church of Rome. But there is no need that the Passing-Bell should contravene the eighty-eighth Canon, and be "rung superstitiously,"—no prayers for the dead are wanting,—the rather it is intended to awaken devotion, and to call for the prayers of the living, that so, God who heareth prayer, would not suffer the soul of a dying sister or brother, for any pains of death, to fall from Him. Yes, reader! instead of running from sermon to sermon so busily as to find no time to be charitable or to do righteousness, Christians of old were fully persuaded of the efficacy of prayer; and whenever, or wherever, the Passing-Bell was heard "swinging slow, with solemn roar,"—"it was not unreasonably, or uncharitably, presumed that such prayers of the living, at that time, might be of service to the dying; or that, in this parti-

* See "Leicestershire," p. 130, ed. folio, 1662, and the Sermon of Bishop Hall's, above quoted, p. 101, where he adds to the above allusions, "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in? saith the Apostle: much more may I say, have ye not churchyards, or other burial places, for the interment of your dead?"

† We would have this understood generally. The mitre and the full dress of the High Priest were not for nothing; and besides this, "Holiness to the Lord" was upon it. It is mere vanity to say that a solemn dress does not give birth to some solemn feelings with the multitude in general; and as for those who scoff at it, as they do at other things serious, and would down with it and with the wearer to the ground, we say with old Fuller, "*He is no friend to the tree who strips it of its bark!*"

cular district, some one might be found, deserving of the name of Christian, who would not grudge a fellow-Christian, a brother, or a sister in Jesus Christ, while contending with the infirmities of his last sickness, and even then *in articulo mortis*, the benefit of his prayers and intercessions at the throne of Grace.”—p. 106. We will conclude these remarks with one of the Occasional Meditations of the good Bishop Hall, so often before quoted in these pages. How well did he consider this solemn sound!

Upon the Tolling of a Passing-Bell.

“How doleful and heavy is this summons of death! This sound is not for our ears, but for our hearts; it calls us not only to our prayers, but to our preparation,—to our prayers for the departing soul,—to our preparation for our own departing. We have never so much need of prayers as in our last combat; then is our great adversary most eager; then are we weakest; then nature is so over-laboured, that it gives us not leisure to make use of gracious motions. There is no preparation so necessary as for this conflict: all our life is little enough to make ready for our last hour. What am I better than my neighbours? How oft hath this bell reported to me the farewell of many more strong and vigorous bodies than my own,—of many more cheerful and lively spirits? And now what doth it but call me to the thought of my parting? Here is no abiding for me: I must away too. Oh thou that art the God of comfort, help thy poor servant that is now struggling with his last enemy. His sad friends stand gazing upon him, and weeping over him, but they cannot succour him; needs must they leave him to do this great work alone; none but Thou, to whom belong the issues of death, canst relieve his distressed and overmatched soul. And for me, let no man die without me, as I die daily, so teach me to die once; acquaint me beforehand with Thy messenger, which I must trust to. Oh! teach me so to number my days, that I may apply my heart to true wisdom.”*

The next chapter, which is the last of the introductory ones, is on “the Excesses committed at Funerals, especially those of the Poorer Classes.” It is altogether good, and it were devoutly to be wished that these excesses could be put an end to. We would observe by the way, that the *Church-ales* mentioned in the eighty-eighth Canon have no allusion at all to the excesses committed at funerals. These are what the Danish call *Grav-öls*. The *Church-ales* in the Canon, though often riotous and disorderly, were commemorative of the dedication of the Church. Hence Warton, in his *History of English Poetry*, is led to observe, perhaps not quite correctly, that *ale*, especially in composition, sometimes

* Works, vol. ii. p. 151. See likewise the beautiful remarks of Sir Thomas Browne, in his *Religio Medici*, part ii. § 6, ed. Wilkin, vol. ii. p. 100. In our older poets there are many allusions to the Passing-Bell. Donne says,

————— “Pray’rs ascend
To heaven in troops at a good man’s passing-bell.”

means a *festival*. By the by, before quitting this chapter we would ask, are not the words "irreverent and irreligious," in page 134, out of place as applied to brutes? The passage, however, is equivocal.

These introductory chapters ended, Mr. Greswell next proceeds to the *Rubrics* premised to the Order for the Burial of the Dead, observing by the way, that in using this office we are "employing a ceremonial of Christian burial, in its general plan and outline, still the same which the Church has been accustomed to use from the earliest ages." As his authority he refers to Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, c. ix.—a work which we here mention to show the good fruit of the late Bishop Jebb's careful examination of all candidates for holy orders in the diocese of Limerick. The passage following is from his Life by Mr. Forster.*

"Nor did the spirit of inquiry, thus inspired or called forth by the regulations of Bishop Jebb, terminate in the purchase,—it led also to the production of important works. The *Origines Liturgicæ*, a work long a desideratum in English divinity, and for which the Church in these countries is indebted to the learned labours of the Rev. William Palmer, now of Worcester College, Oxon., owes its idea and design to the well-directed workings of the author's mind, when a candidate for orders, preparing for examination at Limerick."

We have not space to make extracts from this chapter,—nor yet to allude to the sensible and feeling remarks on the Absence of Females from Funerals of the Upper Classes, or to the Abridgment of the Burial Service in cases of infection, &c. And we have not space, because we feel it absolutely necessary to give the following long but excellent extract from "Tracts for the Times," a publication which, we think, must do infinite good. The tract is called "The Burial Service," and is quite in unison with Mr. Greswell's views, both upon the first Rubric, and upon that after-passage which is so often objected to.†

"But it will be said, that at least we ought not to read the service over the flagrantly wicked, over those who are a scandal to religion. But this is a very different position. I agree with it entirely. Of course we should not do so, and the Church never meant we should. She never wished we should profess our hope of the salvation of habitual drunkards and swearers, open sinners, blasphemers, and the like; not as daring to despair of their salvation, but thinking it unseemly to honour their memory. Though the Church is not endowed with a power of absolute judgment upon individuals, yet she is directed to decide accord-

* See vol. i. p. 243.

† This extract is from the first volume. Two are already published. But the Tracts may be had separately, either in Oxford or at Messrs. Rivingtons.' The extract has been made because it was exactly to the purpose, and also that we might direct our clerical brethren where to find such suitable Tracts as the exigencies of their parishes may require.

ing to external indications, in order to hold up the *rules* of God's governance, and afford a type of it, and an assistance towards the realizing it. As she denies to the scandalously wicked the Lord's Supper, so does she deprive them of her other privileges.

"The Church, I say, does not bid us read the service over open sinners. Hear her own words introducing the service. 'The office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptised, or excommunicated, or have laid violent hands upon themselves.' There is no room to doubt *whom* she meant to be excommunicated—open sinners. Those, therefore, who are pained at the general use of the service, should rather strive to restore the practice of excommunication, than to alter the words used in the service. Surely, if we do not do this, we are clearly defrauding the religious for the sake of keeping close to the wicked.

"Here we see the common course of things in this world;—we omit a duty. In consequence, our services become inconsistent. Instead of tracing our steps we alter the service. What is this but, as it were, to sin upon principle? While we keep to our principles, our sins are inconsistencies; at length, sensible of the absurdity which inconsistency involves, we accommodate our professions to our practice. This is ever the way of the world, but it should not be the way of the Church.

"I will join heart and hand with any one who will struggle for a restoration of that 'godly discipline,' the restoration of which our Church publicly professes she considers desirable; but God forbid any one should so depart from her spirit as to mould her formularies to fit the case of deliberate sinners! * And is not this what we are plainly doing, if we alter the Burial Service as proposed? Are we not recognizing the right of men to receive Christian burial, about whom we do not like to express a hope? Why should they have Christian burial at all?"

Alas! we fear we may look in vain for the re-establishment of strict Church discipline. Even in temporals—as said Hamlet to the grave-digger—"The age is grown so picked, that the toe of the peasant comes so near the heel of the courtier, he galls his kibe;" how much more so in matters concerning the Church! However, we have scrupulously cited the above words, and they, at least, ought to strike the declaimer against ordinances, and the slanderer of the Church Services, dumb.

Chapter VII. relates to the Anthems, or sentences appointed to be said or sung while the minister is preceding the corpse—"a custom," says Mr. Palmer, "of the greatest antiquity, as we learn from the Apostolical Constitutions, from Dionysius Areopagite, Chrysostom, and other sources." Than these sentences nothing can be well more appropriate,—more affecting,—more true. The first is what our blessed Lord himself delivered for

* We recollect taking the weekly duties for a neighbouring clergyman during his absence, and, to our great surprise, finding the Burial Service *bracketed*,—evidently with the intent to omit this or that passage, according as the life of the deceased might have been,—sinner, that is, or saint.. What is this but to take the fan into our own hands? These things ought not to be.

the comfort of the two sisters as he accompanied them to the tomb of their brother Lazarus. They certify the Resurrection of the Dead, and thus, in our Saviour's own words, his ambassadors commence this solemn service, bidding, as it were, the mourners following not to weep as those without hope, inasmuch as the corpse of their dead brother or sister shall again flourish as an herb, *and the earth shall cast out the dead*. We find accordingly that these selfsame words have been used as a part of the burial offices of all Christians. Nor is the next sentence less appropriate, declaring, in the words of the patriarch, Job, the Resurrection of the Body;* or, as our Church has taken care to express it in the three several Baptismal Services, the Resurrection of the FLESH,—clearly thereby declaring her own Belief. This leads Mr. Greswell to a discussion on the identity of the Resurrection-Body, which is perfectly unobjectionable, and would seem to have been suggested to him by Bishop Butler's Dissertation "Of Personal Identity," which the reader will find at the end of the first volume of the Clarendon edition of his invaluable Works. The last sentence, taken from St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy, and from the Book of Job, is not less fitting to the occasion than the other two; for what can be more to the purpose, more likely to reach the heart at such a time than the Scripture testimony to the vanity of all worldly possessions? Nothing. So that it has been well said, when we consider all these sentences together, "Were the happiness of the next world as closely apprehended as the felicities of this, it were a martyrdom to live."

" The Saviour wept—the Saviour wept
 O'er him he loved—corrupting clay!
 But then He spake the word, and Death
 Gave up his prey!
 A little while—a little while,
 And the dark grave shall yield its trust;
 Yea, render every atom up
 Of human dust.
 What matters then—what matters then,
 Who earliest lays him down to rest?—
 Nay, 'to depart, and be with Christ,'
 Is surely best." †

* See the very remarkable words of Sir Thomas Browne, in his *Religio Medici*, part i. § 48, Wilkin, vol. ii. p. 68. "I believe that our estranged and divided ashes shall unite again, &c." Jeremy Taylor observes in his *own* way, "St. Ignatius, who was buried in the bodies of lions, and St. Polycarp, who was burned to ashes, shall have their bones and their flesh again, with greater comfort than those violent persons who slept among kings, having usurped their thrones when they were alive, and their sepulchres when they were dead."—vol. iv. p. 568.

† From a beautiful little volume of Miss Bowles's, the authoress of "Chapters upon Churchyards." She must have been to the grave to weep there!

Σαφφούς παῦσα μὲν, ἀλλὰ γόδα!

Chapters VIII. and IX. are on the Proper Psalms and on the Proper Lessons. In this part of the service, as in all other offices, we have followed the custom of antiquity, approaching here, perhaps, nearer to the Eastern than to the Western Churches. In the latter the Eucharist was celebrated at this time, and prayers were made for the happiness of the deceased; but these are both discontinued, the one as a matter of course, because Protestants look upon masses for the dead as "a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God," (Art. xxii.); the other probably because, though firm in the faith, the hearts even of those who looked for the appearance of their Saviour, might be bowed down with over-much sorrow for so high a feast, and be ready rather for *the bread of mourners*. Be this as it may, our Burial Service now follows what was observed in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, as we learn from the *Euchologicon sive Rituale Græcorum* of Goar the Dominican, the correspondent of Archbishop Usher. As concerns the Psalms, we may safely refer to what Mr. Greswell says upon them; nor do we see any reason to expunge any part of his remarks, unless it be the last sentence, where the application of εἰς ἐνέσιμον to the gift of God can hardly be correct. We mention this, however, merely by the way, because if it be taken connectedly with our author's remarks, there is really nothing objectionable in the words—ἀδωρον δῶρον, εἰς ἐνέσιμον.

In turning to the Lesson—a part of 1 Cor. xv.—we cannot but say that it is altogether in unison with the solemn ritual we are treating of. Accordingly we find in Mr. Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, as we might have expected,

"that a part of the Lesson which follows has been used by the English Church for a considerable length of time. It was anciently used in the celebration of the Eucharist, which formerly took place in England, as in other western churches, at this time; and although the English Church has not continued the custom, but adopted the practice of the Church of Constantinople, the importance of this part of Scripture has caused it be used as the proper Lesson on the present occasion. In the Church of Constantinople they read part of the fourth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians, and a Gospel from St. John."

Mr. Greswell, in his Commentary, is led to expatiate on the change of the resurrection-body,—and here, though we cannot say that there is any thing really objectionable, yet we may be allowed to hint at the old adage, *Ne quid nimis*. And, indeed, we think that some few parts do deviate from that chastened and tempered language which should scrupulously be used on so awful a subject. We would instance, particularly, pp. 295, 302. The same remarks may also be applied to vol. ii. p. 124—128, though per-

haps the harrowing nature of the subject, in the latter instance, may plead some excuse. Heroic lines, however, in prose, ought to be studiously avoided. They are not natural, and call to our recollection the chapter of Aristotle (*Rhet.* lib. iii. c. iii.)*
Περὶ ψυχρᾶς λέξεως.

“Singula quæque locum teneant sortita decenter.”

Having thus far touched upon what we look upon as the only blemish in the volumes before us,—and having before apologized for what some might call rhapsodies,—we shall not refer to the point again,—observing simply, that, if the work should (as we hope) be so popular as to call for a second edition, we trust the author will cut down the “*ambitiosa ornamenta*.”

Other points dwelt upon by Mr. Greswell in this chapter, are, degrees of glory in the resurrection-body, the last trump, the Mediatorial kingdom of Jesus Christ, and that glorious ἐπινικιον μέλος which occurs at the end of the chapter—“O death! where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?” These are all handled with the pen of a ready writer,—but we have no time to dwell upon them. We will, therefore, end these remarks with the words of Theophylact on those of the Apostle: Ωσανεὶ γερόμενα ἰδὼν τὰ πρᾶγματα, ἐνθυσιαῖ, καὶ ἐπινίκιον βοᾷ, καὶ ἀλαλάζει, οἷον ἐκ χειμένων τῷ θανάτῳ ἐπεμβαίνων. *Operum*, ii. 231. B. (*Notes and Illustrations*, vol. ii. p. 339.)

Chapter X. commences with the Anthems appointed to be said or sung while the corpse is made ready to be laid in the earth.

“The reading of the lesson being ended,” observes Mr. Greswell, “that part of the service which is appointed to be solemnized upon entering the church, is over; and the part which is directed to begin and proceed by the grave side, follows next in order. This second and last division of the offices for the interment of the dead, according to the ritual of the Church of England, though, generally speaking, all celebrated without the church, and all by the side of the grave, or sepulchre, which is intended to receive the dead body, consists of three parts: first, that which precedes the commission of the body to the ground: secondly, that which is performed while the interment itself, or consignment of the body to the ground, is taking place; and thirdly, that which is directed to follow when this particular ceremony is over; and, consequently, comprehends what remains of the service to the close of the whole.”—vol. ii. p. 1.

And here, in these Anthems, as in the rest of her services, the Church of England follows the order which is found in the ancient rituals of the Eastern and Western Churches. The

* See the Remarks of Archbishop Whately, in his *Elements of Rhetoric*, p. 212.

whole four of these Anthems, indeed, may be seen in Mr. Palmer, extracted from the Salisbury Manual,* and they correspond almost word for word. The compilers, however, of our Liturgy did not, certainly, take the last altogether from that source. The latter words, at least, of that, are found, as Archbishop Lawrence has observed, in a "German hymn of Luther, composed as a kind of poetical paraphrase upon another very ancient one in the offices of the Romish Church. The words of Luther in the latter part of this hymn are, "Heiliger Herre Gott, heiliger starker Gott, heiliger barmhertziger Heyland, du ewiger Gott, lass uns nicht *enfallen von des rechten glaubens trost.*"—*Geistliches Handbuchlein*, p. 136. "O holy Lord God, O holy mighty God, O holy merciful Saviour, thou God eternal, suffer us not to *fall from the consolation of the true faith.*"† With the exception of a single passage in page 45, all that Mr. Greswell says on these Anthems is in unison with the rest of his work. And even as regards the passage alluded to, we can say, True, most true! But is it well to rake the charnel-house? Is it not—(to use the expressive words of John Miller in his excellent sermons,)—is it not like "ransacking all the depths of iniquity," as some do in their sermons? We think so, and should be glad, therefore, that it were away. We have only further to remark how studiously our Church avoids all prayer for the dead, endeavouring to turn all she says to the soul's health of the living;—and conclude with an extract from Master Hugh Latimer's Sermons,—that constant martyr of Jesus Christ,—which has an especial reference to the last Anthem.

"Thirdly, I commend unto you the souls departed this life in the faith of Christ, that ye remember to give laudes, praise and thanks to Almighty God for his great goodness and mercy showed unto them, in that great need and conflict against the devil and sin, and that gave them at the hour of death faith in his Son's death and passion, whereby they might conquer and overcome, and get the victory. Give thanks, I say, for this, adding prayers and supplications for yourselves, that it may please God to give you the like faith and grace, to trust only unto the death of his dear Son, as he gave unto them. For as they be gone, so must we; and the devil will be as ready to tempt us, as he was them, and our sins will light as heavy upon us, as theirs did upon them: and

* For the History of the Sarum "Use" see also Mr. Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i. pp. 186, 187. It derives its origin from Osmund, bishop of that see in A. D. 1078, and chancellor of England. It is said to have been adopted in some part of France, and even in Portugal. The ritual books of York and Hereford have been printed, but we are not aware that this has.

† See Archbishop Lawrence's Bampton Lectures. Notes on Sermon VIII. p. 448. He is led to remark on the passage as one, amongst endless others, which proves "the impossibility of reconciling the doctrine contained in our Liturgy and Homilies with the Calvinistic predestination."

we are as weak and unable to resist, as were they. Pray, therefore, that we may have grace to die in the same faith of Christ as they did, and at the latter day be raised with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and be partakers with Christ in the kingdom of heaven."*

The XIth Chapter of Mr. Greswell's work is, on the form of words, provided for the interment, which Mr. Palmer considers as peculiar to our Church, as "the rituals of the East and the West appoint some psalm or anthem to be sung or said while the body is placed in the tomb; but the same form nearly has been used in the English Church for many ages, though anciently it followed after the body was covered with earth, and while the earth was placed upon it." As to that part of this formula which others besides sectarians are wont to object to,—there is no need for us to say more about it than what we have already said in the extract given, some pages back, from the "Tracts for the Times." The Church never intended that this office should be read over ungodly sinners,—they, according to the ancient ecclesiastical discipline for which old Latimer called aloud in his sermons before King Edward, would very properly have been excommunicated,—and, could the apostolic Bishop Wilson's words have found a hearing on earth, no sectarians would now have flouted uncharitably, and no sincere churchmen would have been pained by conscientious scruples. But even as it is, the words, perhaps, will bear an easier and a more charitable construction than some are inclined to put upon them, and so all scruple and doubtfulness might be avoided. Let it be observed, then, that they stand thus,—“in sure and certain hope of” (not this one's or that one's, but) “*the* Resurrection to eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ.” In the subsequent parts of the Office, when we thank God that he has been pleased to deliver a brother or a sister out of the “*miseries of this sinful world*,”—even if he or she were a sinner, still had life been spared, they might have sunk deeper and deeper into the slough of “*wretchedness of unclean living*.”—and so, even in that case, we may charitably thank God with reference to the living also, that they have escaped such a scandal and such a reproach,—and we needs must ask, with faithful Abraham,—“*Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?*”† And then, as to the hope in the concluding collect, we have only to say to one and all, let him that is without sin among you, and cares not to make the hearts of his brethren sad, let him, we say, first cast a stone at our *rejoicing in hope*. What is here said,

* See Sermons, p. 91. Ed. 4to. 1575. Black letter. The language in the text is modernized against our will. Our reference was made some years ago,—and not having the copy at hand, we were obliged to write for the extract.

† Gen. c. xviii. 25.

however, is but, as it were, an umpire's or a daysman's word,—our own sentiments are expressed above, and they will be found altogether in unison with those of Mr. Greswell, whose remarks are most excellent. We conclude with his pious wish, leaving out the darker side.*

“ Oh ! would that every individual Christian, (may the author be excused for inserting here a wish to that effect,) whose mortal remains may be brought to be interred according to this Office, thus, as it appears, provide for one description of the dead only—as the supposed ecclesiastical discipline is now administered in our Christian community,—would, I say, that every nominal member of the communion of the Church at present, by the Christian exemplariness of his past existence, might still warrant, at the time of his death, on the part of the surviving members of the same communion, the well assured hope of such a resurrection from the dead, as eventually awaiting him—the hope that his lifeless body, consigned to the ground amid the tears, the sobs, and groans of weeping relatives, already sanctified and consecrated for that future glory by the indwelling of every needful Christian grace—upon the dawning of that auspicious morn, will awake from the dust, and sing, will start forth into the plenary enjoyment of its promised crown of excellence and perfection—a star of the resurrection, to illumine the abodes of the blessed with its peculiar ray of glory for ever.”—vol. ii. p. 94.

The XIIth Chapter of the work before us is on the Anthem appointed to be said or sung next after the interment,—one of great antiquity, and taken, as is well known, from *Rev. xiv. 13*. In it, it is said, that the dead which die in the Lord are blessed, and for this reason, *they rest from their labours*. Accordingly, it is a text which may intimate the intermediate state not to be one of insensibility,—as also do the texts which follow: *Luke, xvi. 22; xxiii. 43; Cor. v. 6—9; xii. 4; Phil. i. 21—24*; as well as others which it is not necessary now to allude to. On this most interesting subject Mr. Greswell dwells at large, and those who have not thought upon this point will find here abundant matter faithfully and impartially set before them. But inasmuch as this is not an essential object of our faith, and many excellent Christians, both in ancient and modern times, have differed as to its acceptation,—we shall say nothing further on the subject, simply laying before our readers the following extract from Bishop Beveridge's works, in which he takes it for granted, as a point

* On reading the last paragraph of this chapter we could not but call to mind the departure of that good and faithful servant of his Lord,—the late Divinity Professor in Oxford,—Dr. Edward Burton. Speaking of the loss of friends, or of gifted men, who seem, in their day, the earthly support of the Church, Mr. Newman observes, in his Sermon on the Ascension of our Lord: “ For what we know, their removal hence is as necessary for the furtherance of the objects we have at heart, as was the departure of our Saviour.”—vol. ii. p. 236.

which did not admit of dispute,—and who shall say it is not a comforting point?*

“He adds, ‘And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself.’ But what? Will he not receive us before that? Yes, certainly, he will receive our souls, as soon as ever they depart out of our bodies, as we may gather from what he himself said to the thief upon the cross, ‘To day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’ For, from hence it is evident, that although the penitent body was to be laid in the earth, yet his soul was to be carried the very same day he died directly to Christ, in paradise or heaven, where he then was as God, although his manhood ascended not till some days after. The same appears from St. Paul’s ‘desire to depart and be with Christ:’ which plainly shows that he firmly believed that he should be with Christ so soon as ever he departed out of this life. But the clearest demonstration of this great truth, and that which puts it beyond all doubt, is taken from St. Stephen, who, being just at the point of death, committed his soul into the hands of Christ, saying, ‘Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.’ Which, questionless, he would not have done, had he not been fully assured by the Holy Ghost, that Christ would, according to his desire, receive his spirit unto himself, at the same moment that it left his body; and so doubtless every soul that ever departed out of this life in the true faith of Christ, is now with him in heaven, his holy angels carrying it, as they did Lazarus, directly thither.

“But what then doth our Lord mean by his coming again and receiving us to himself? His meaning in short is, that although he was now to leave this world, and to go up to heaven, there to continue many years, preparing a place for us; yet at the last day, when the whole number of his elect shall be accomplished, he will come hither again, and then he will receive us altogether, both soul and body, and so our whole man unto himself, that so the same persons who believed in him and served him upon earth, may live with him for evermore in heaven; as he himself hath promised in the following words, saying, ‘I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.’”

The XIIIth and last chapter of these volumes is taken up with the rest of the Office, including the short, or lesser Litany,—the prayer which is headed by the word “Priest,”† the Collect, and the Benediction. Concerning these severally, Mr. Palmer

* The subjoined extract is from vol. iv. p. 302, of the 8vo. edition of his works. It is far different, as to the comfort to be derived from it, from the statements set forth in Archbishop Whately’s *Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State*,—a work in which so much is over-stated, and so much under-stated. As to the doctrinal point, we said above, that we were not called to dwell upon it further. We remember the words of South, “Nothing can be more irrational than to be dogmatical in things doubtful; and to determine where wise men only dispute.”—vol. v. p. 243.

† See the learned note on the word “Collect,” p. 196—198. We have nothing to add to it, and the following remark is quite true: “The word Collect, in our Liturgy, is the proper denomination for a general and ordinary, in opposition to a special or occasional form of prayer.” “Collecta,” in Latin, is probably derived from the Greek *συναξίς* or *συναγωγή*.

observes, "The ancient manuals of the English Church appointed a similar order to succeed the burial; but the collects which we use in this place are not of great antiquity, though the preface of the first is found in the manual of Salisbury, and in some very ancient monuments of the Western Church." All that Mr. Greswell says on this Litany, on the Lord's Prayer,—which he calls "reverently brief, concisely full, composedly fervent, eloquently simple, and sublimely expressive,"—all that he says, also, on the duty of the Christian mourner,—is quite appropriate, and must be acceptable to the thoughtful and religious mind. Indeed, what he says upon the subject of the Lord's Prayer we could heartily wish were ingrafted in the hearts of those who complain of the length of our services, and would exclude its repetition from the Liturgy.

Mr. Greswell next proceeds to the first of the two Prayers, and having considered the introduction, (which is a paraphrase of our Saviour's words, Luke, xx. 38,) goes on to dwell on that part of it wherein we beseech Almighty God "of His gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of His elect and to hasten His kingdom:" in other words, to bring to a close this mysterious dispensation of providence and grace which has been going on from the beginning of the world to the present time, constituting, as it does, the scheme of the state of probation—the condition, for the time being, of the "Church militant upon earth." The consideration of the words "the number of His elect," leads our author to make some remarks on the terms Predestination and Election, and we may say, without fear of contradiction, that no one can read them without acknowledging that they are made discreetly, soberly, and advisedly. For this reason we give the three following lengthy extracts. The two first are, as it were, introductory to the latter,—which is the summing up of what has been said on the point:

"It is supposed then in the above prayer—so much of it, at least, as relates to the consummation in question—that a process of trial or discrimination both has been, and still is, going on among God's moral and responsible creatures upon earth; the end and effect of which will be, to distinguish that portion of them described by the name of the elect of God, from the rest, whom the event will prove not to be entitled to that name. This process of trial has been going on from the beginning of human existence; and is not yet brought to an end. The same scheme of moral probation, with the same end in view, and producing the same effects, in discriminating us under the two classes intended to be distinguished thereby, has been in force ever since the Fall—varying only as to the mode or manner of the probation, with the circumstances of the time, and according as the Revelation of the Divine Will, in conformity to which, on points both of faith and of practice, the scheme is

regulated, was more or less complete, under the Antediluvian, the Patriarchal, or the Levitical Dispensation respectively, down to the appointed time of the promulgation of the Gospel, when it assumed that last and most definite form, in which it is especially applicable to Christians ; or the nominal members of the visible Church, as established among Christians on earth.

“ Since that time, the doctrine and duties of the Gospel revelation, the one in their influence on the understanding, the other on the heart and affections, the life and conversation,—are the touchstone by which this work of discrimination is still carried forward,—the outward criterion by which the nominal professor of the same religion is still distinguished from the real,—the fan by which the wheat is winnowed and separated from the chaff. The elect are those upon whom these doctrines and duties produce the desired effect ; and the non-elect are they upon whom they do not. It would seem also from the language of the prayer in reference to this subject, that the former have beforehand their appointed number, and a number known to God ; the filling up of which too to that destined amount, he may either retard or accelerate, according to the purposes of His wisdom and goodness, (which last attribute is here particularly referred to) ; in a word, that Heaven itself (a point, this, to which I have before called the attention of the reader) must ultimately be found to contain a preordained number of inhabitants, and by parity of consequence, Hell its similarly fixed amount of inmates.” —Vol. ii. pp. 168, 169.

“ With regard, then, to the description of moral agents which require to be understood by the name of the *Elect* ;* it appears to the author of these observations, that none are to be supposed designated by it, to whom the name must be considered applicable, because of an absolute unconditional decree of Almighty God, in their behalf. The election implied by it, must be understood to denote something which has been the result of foreseen goodness of character. This goodness it is which has rendered the subject meet to be elected by God. The election made him not good,—but the quality of character having been first produced, by the agency of causes properly and strictly moral, (the operation of which, however mysterious to us may be the exercise of that knowledge, —God, as an omniscient Being, foresaw,) the election so made of the subject in question, was the consequence of his previous personal worthiness, or his previous right and Christian use of the means of grace. To be an elected person, according to any other construction of the import of that name, (and equally so, we may add, to be a reprobate or unelected person,) would be to suppose an human agent, in either instance, a mere machine, a passive instrument in bringing about a Divine purpose, affecting the happiness or misery of such and such of its creatures,

* Jones of Nayland, of whose works the late excellent Bishop van Mildert thought so highly, says “ The true notion of Predestination is to be met with in Ephesians, i. 11, 12, where those are said to be predestinated to the praise of God’s glory who *trusted* in Christ. Our attainment of eternal happiness is the *consequence* of our belief in Christ, and the irreversible decree of God is, that those that believe in him should not perish, and this is probably the only sense in which the doctrine of predestination and election can be maintained from Scripture.” —Works, vol. iv. p. 39, note.

—over which, in its use and subserviency to that effect, the agent himself had no control, and with which, except as destined to be affected, in one way or the other, by its consequences, he himself had nothing to do. Such, I say, would be the result,—if we were to look upon election in one of these cases, as the necessary cause of Christian goodness of character, and not as the result of the foreseen existence of it; or reprobation in the other, to be the necessary cause of the contrary description of character, and not simply the consequence of it, as equally foreseen also.”—pp. 178, 179.

“Two truths are clearly revealed to us, or clearly ascertainable by us,—both having the testimony of Scripture, and the further evidence of human reason, in their favour. One is, that the foreknowledge of the Deity, even when directed to events of an exclusively contingent description, (the result of the free agency of man,) is absolute and unconditional; the other, that men, notwithstanding, are left themselves in possession of a moral power of choosing how, under the different measures and degrees of natural or spiritual light dispensed to them,—of natural or spiritual facilities and opportunities vouchsafed to them,—they will act.

“Of each of these truths considered apart from the other, we must have the clearest conviction. No truth can be plainer to us than this, that we ourselves are free agents. There needs no argument to convince man of that, of which his own consciousness assures him beyond a doubt, just as much as of his own existence. And yet it is equally certain that God must foresee all things, even the contingent results of our own free agency. Nor in strictness ought these two truths to be considered, except distinctly; in which point of view it is manifest that neither of them would be liable to doubt or controversy. The free agency of man, considered by itself, and the foreknowledge of the Deity, considered also by itself, could neither of them well be denied or disputed. It is only when they begin to be considered in conjunction, that they begin to create difficulties, and to be liable to objections; because it is only when regarded in conjunction, that they begin to seem to clash. Man appears a free agent, when considered by himself; but no longer free, when considered as the subject of the foreknowledge of God. And yet it is manifest that we ourselves are concerned with nothing, except what man is, considered in himself; not what he is in reference to another and an independent being. It ought to satisfy us to feel assured that we ourselves are free, without seeking to inquire how that freedom may be compatible with the prescience of God.”—pp. 191, 192.

The rest of this chapter is taken up with the contents of the Collect, and with the Benedictory Prayer, from 2 Cor. xiii. 14, in which our author is led to dilate upon the death of sin and life of righteousness,—on the common necessity of dying,—on the last day, with its preceding signs,—on the general Resurrection, and the final acceptance. We have no space, however, to dwell more at length on these interesting subjects. Heartily

thanking, therefore, Mr. Greswell for these volumes, the intent of which is excellent, the piety of which is evident, and the execution, as a whole, good,—we gladly extract, and join in, his final prayer :

“ Let the author conclude with a prayer, in which he trusts to have his reader's hearty concurrence—*Esto perpetua*. May Christian faith and hope, Christian * sorrow for the dead, and Christian patience and resignation in the living—continue to be thus expressed, until what time, shall we say ? until the advent of that day, so often alluded to in these commentaries, when the reign of corruption and mortality shall cease, and Christian mourners shall be called upon to bury and lament over deceased friends and relatives no more.”—pp. 248, 249.

Thus have we carefully gone through this beautiful and affecting office of our Church, and have severally alluded to the antiquity of its parts, and to the purity of its doctrine. We had a word or two of our own to say more,—but the language of Hooker and of Bishop Horne presented itself to our memory, and though dead, they shall yet speak for us. “ The end,” says Hooker, “ of funeral rites is, first, to show that love towards the party deceased, which nature requireth ; then, to do him that honour which is fit both generally for man, and particularly for the quality of his person ; last of all, to testify the care which the Church hath to comfort the living, and the hope which we all have concerning the resurrection of the dead.”† The words of Horne which we would refer to are, “ Let not man presume, who withereth like the green herb ; but then, let not man despair, whose nature, with all its infirmities, the Son of God hath taken upon him. The flower which fadeth in Adam, blooms anew in Christ, never to fade again. The mercy of Jehovah in his Messiah is everlasting, and of that everlasting mercy poor frail man is the object. It extendeth to all the generations of the faithful servants of God. Death shall not deprive them of its benefits, nor shall the grave hide them from the efficacious influence of its all enlivening beams, which shall pierce even into those regions of desolation, and awaken the sleepers of six thousand years. Man must pay to justice the temporal penalty of his sins ; but mercy shall raise him again, to receive the eternal

* Cowper beautifully says “ In the case of believers, death has lost his sting, not only with respect to those he takes away, but with respect to survivors also. Nature indeed will always suggest some causes of sorrow, when an amiable and Christian friend departs ; but the Scripture, so many more, and so much more important reasons to rejoice, that on such occasions, perhaps, more remarkably than any other, sorrow is turned into joy.”—Vol. iv. p. 275, of Southey's edition,—which may well indeed be called an accession to English literature.

† See Eccles. Polity, book v. § 75 ; vol. ii. p. 408 ; and cf. Jer. Taylor, vol. iv. p. 565.—“ Of the contingencies and treating our dead.” The passage of Bishop Horne is from his Commentary on Psalm ciii. 17, 18.

reward, purchased by his Saviour's righteousness." Happy, then, those who are baptized for the dead !

It remains now that we devote the little space we have left to the mention of the beautiful and only complete edition of Sir Thomas Browne's Works which has ever been published. The reason of its being appended to this article is obviously on account of his *Hydriotaphia, or Urn Burial*,—a treatise in which, amongst much that is curious, and something that is fanciful, almost every thing that could be said has been exhausted,—and, as we hinted before, it seems odd that Mr. Greswell should never have referred to it. We heartily wish it had been in our power to have devoted an article to the works of this remarkable and good man,—his life we could have written *con amore*, as his works, —especially the *Vulgar Errors* and the *Religio Medici*,—together with Evelyn's *Silva*, and old Burton's *Anatomie of Melancholie*, have ever been amongst our especial favourites. It has, however, become necessary to devote these pages almost exclusively to professed * Theological Works,—for this reason, therefore, the present edition must be appended like a postscript to a letter,—and a postscript, be it remarked, often contains most affectionate regards.

Of this edition we are bound to say that every lover of Sir Thomas Browne's works should be possessed. It has been the labour of twelve years, and (we have heard) no less than 1400*l.* have been expended upon it. We hope a second edition will soon be called for, and then some typographical errors, together with the "additions and corrections" alluded to and inserted in vol. ii. pp. xxi. xxii. may be re-arranged, and the only blemish of the book taken off. In these days of penny-trumpet literature, Mr. Wilkin deserves the cordial thanks of every scholar, for having had the courage to go through with and to publish, at his own expense, an edition of a work, which, of any other, shows the great talents, the great research, as well as the great piety and charity of its author,—of one who could never hear the toll of a passing bell, though in his mirth, without his prayers and best wishes for the departing spirit,—of one who could not go to view

* We cannot avoid remarking here that the letters of Browne are replete with pure and unostentatious piety. Those who will refer to pp. 3, 9, 12, 261, 271, 313, 319, which we have accidentally marked down, will see double beauty in the passage following, from the *Religio Medici*: "I cannot see one say his prayers, but, instead of imitating him, I fall into supplication for him, who perhaps is no more to me than a common nature: and if God hath vouchsafed an ear to my supplications, there are surely many happy that never saw me, and enjoy the blessing of mine unknown devotions."—Vol. ii. p. 100. It is needless for us to refer the readers to the *Religio Medici*, and *Christian Morals*; but there are many papers in the fourth volume connected with religious topics, which will probably be new, and show forth the deep thought of this good worthy of the olden time.

the body of a patient, without calling unto God for his soul.—*Religio Medici*, part ii. c. vi. The first volume of the edition before us contains Dr. Johnson's Life of Sir Thomas Browne, with a Supplementary Memoir by Mr. Wilkin, together also with the Domestic and Miscellaneous Correspondence—a racy and interesting collection, whether we look to Sir Thomas Browne himself, his sons, the goodly Dorothy, or the fascinating urchin “*little Tomey*,” his grandchild. The second volume contains the *Religio Medici*, and part of the *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, or Inquiries into Vulgar and Common Errors,—with prefaces by the editor, containing much information, which may be said also of the notes at the bottom of the pages in the several volumes. The third volume contains the remainder of the *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*,—together with the *Garden of Cyrus*, *Hydriotaphia*, and *Brampton Urns*. In the editor's preface to the three last-mentioned treatises he observes that he has* “modernized the spelling” as well of these as of all Browne's other works, but not the phraseology as characteristic of the author. Of the phraseology we will say a word presently,—and we could heartily wish that the original spelling had been left as it was, because that too is oftentimes characteristic, and we know well that the writings of the learned and judicious Hooker have suffered from such an alteration,

“*Tantum elementa queunt permutato ordine rerum.*”

Volume the Fourth contains the *Repertorium*, or the *Antiquities of Norwich*,—Letter to a Friend, upon the occasion of the death of his intimate Friend,—*Christian Morals*,—*Miscellany Tracts*, and *Unpublished Papers*. As connected with the Contents of the *British Critic*, we have above alluded to the *Christian Morals* and the *Religio Medici*. We may now refer the reader, on the same grounds, to Tract i., which contains “*Observations upon several Plants mentioned in Scripture* ;” to Tract iii., on a question put to him as to the “*Fishes eaten by our Saviour with his Disciples after his Resurrection from the Dead* ;” and to Tract x. “*Of the Situations of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, in the Dead Sea.*” Besides these, the reader will find many passages relative to Theology in the “*Extracts from Common Place Books*,” which we have not space to refer to particularly; with one, however, as it shows the man, we shall conclude, after having said a word on Browne's phraseology, which we will do in the language of one whom Browne would have loved,—a living author who has taken a fuller and more comprehensive, as well as a more exact view of the literature of our own country, than any

* Vol. iii. p. 379.

one whom we could name,—we mean Mr. Southey, who, in speaking of the style of writing in Charles the Second's time, has the following striking remarks:—

“ Three different fashions in writing had prevailed, which were alike faulty. There was the dry, dull, dismal manner of the sober Puritans ; there was a style of overstrained and elaborate wit dealing in affectations of every kind ; and there was an ornate style, studded with sesquipedalian Latinisms, Grecisms, Hebraisms, and Arabiaisms, which might frequently send the best scholar to his Lexicons. Indeed, a dictionary was published for enabling some persons to read, and others to write in this refined language. The most remarkable examples of it are found in the poems of Henry More, and in the works of Sir Thomas Browne ; to whose peculiar genius, however, this sort of language was so well suited, that it would not have been possible for him to have expressed his thoughts so felicitously, or so naturally, in any other manner. *But it required the knowledge, and the power, and the feeling of such a man to render it tolerable.* Its effect upon inferior writers was to mar good matter, or to render what was worthless intolerable.”*

We suppose there is no reader of Browne's works who has not been struck and amazed with the phraseology alluded to,—but we are quite agreed with Mr. Southey in thinking, that in other and weaker, and less cunning hands, it would have been intolerable. That excellent divine, the witty South, was evidently tickled by the peculiarity of Browne's language, in Browne's hands, as the reader may see by turning to his† Sermon on Eccles. vii. 10. *Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this,*—which is totally different, in style, from all the rest of his published ones, and concerning which, in a letter lying before us, Southey says, “ It is most evidently written in imitation of Sir Thomas Browne, probably as a trial of skill.”

We conclude with the following beautiful extract from the Common Place Book above alluded to. It is hardly necessary to say that it was never intended for any other eye than his own.

“ To be sure that no day pass, without calling upon God in a solemn-formed prayer, seven times within the compass thereof; that is, in the morning, and at night, and five times between ; taken up long ago from the examples of David and Daniel, and a compunction and shame that I had omitted it so long, when I had fully read of the custom of the Mahometans, to pray five times in the day.

* The above will be found in the masterly Paper on Dr. Sayer's Works in the Quarterly Review, No. lxix. pp. 187, 188. The italics are our own.

† This sermon is in vol. v. pp. 232, 249, of the Clarendon Press Edition. By the way we may remark, that the “ aphorism of Horace,” mentioned in p. 236, is not his but Juvenal's. See Sat. xv. v. 70. The following would seem to be more in South's than in Sir Thomas Browne's style. “ The maunderings of discontent are like the voice and behaviour of a swine, who, when he feels it rain, runs grumbling about, and by that indeed discovers his nature, but does not avoid the storm.”—p. 245.

"To pray and magnify God in the night, and my dark bed, when I could not sleep; to have short ejaculations whenever I awaked; and when the four o'clock bell awoke me, or my first discovery of the light, to say the collect of our Liturgy;* 'Eternal God, who hath safely brought me to the beginning of this day,' &c.

"To pray in all places where privacy inviteth; in any house, highway, or street; and to know no street or passage in this city which may not witness that I had not forgot God and my Saviour in it; and that no parish or town where I have been, may not say the like.

"To take occasion of praying, upon the sight of any church, which I see or pass by, as I ride about.

"Since the necessities of the sick, and unavoidable diversions of my profession, keep me often from church, yet to take all possible care, that I might never miss sacraments upon their accustomed days.

"To pray daily and particularly for sick patients, and in general for others, whensoever, howsoever, under whose care soever; and at the entrance into the house of the sick, to say, 'The peace and mercy of God be in this place.'

"After a sermon, to make a thanksgiving, and desire a blessing, and to pray for the minister.

"In tempestuous weather, lightning, and thunder, either night or day, to pray for God's merciful protection, and his mercy upon their souls, bodies, and goods.†

"Upon sight of beautiful persons, to bless God in his creatures, to pray for the beauty of their souls, and to enrich them with inward graces to be answerable unto the outward. Upon sight of deformed persons, to send them inward graces, and enrich their souls, and give them the beauty of the resurrection."—vol. iv. pp. 420, 421.

* This is given as written by Sir Thomas Browne. The prayer begins thus, "O Lord, our heavenly Father, Almighty and everlasting God," &c.

† We cannot help giving in a note this sweet passage from Jeremy Taylor, "Venerable Bede reports of St. Chad, that if a great gust of wind suddenly arose, he presently made some holy ejaculations, to beg favour of God for all mankind who might possibly be concerned in the effects of that wind; but, if a storm succeeded, he fell prostrate to the earth, and grew as violent in prayer as the storm was, either at land or sea. But if God added thunder and lightning, he went to the church, and there spent all his time, during the tempest, in reciting litanies, psalms, and other holy prayers, till it pleased God to restore his favour, and to seem to forget his anger. And the good bishop added this reason; because these are the extensions and stretchings forth of God's hand, and yet he did not strike: but he that trembles not, when he sees God's arm held forth to strike us, understands neither God's mercies nor his own danger; he neither knows what those horrors were, which the people saw from Mount Sinai, nor what the glories and amazements shall be at the great day of judgment."—Hist. Gent. Anglor. lib. iii. c. 18. Of the Causes and Manner of Divine Judgments, Works, vol. iii. p. 232.

ART. VIII.—*The Brothers' Controversy, being a genuine Correspondence between a Clergyman of the Church of England and a Layman of Unitarian Opinions.* London. 1835.

THIS small volume consists, in accordance with its title, of a series of letters between a Clergyman and his brother-in-law upon the Trinitarian question, or rather upon those previous questions which the controversy involves, such as the mode of seeking the truth, the use of reason, and the like. It is certainly interesting, but painfully so; and that because it presents the picture of two well-meaning men disputing about sacred subjects on insufficient or mistaken grounds, and so leaving off as they began. In thus speaking we should be grieved indeed to seem to imply that their respective opinions are, in any point of view, to be put on a level, the one not higher nor better than the other. Socinianism is a deadly heresy, full of everlasting evil to its wilful professors, and influential moreover on their moral character; still there is a way of opposing it, which does but seem to justify, and does but confirm them in it. And such in the main is that which is now exhibited in the work before us.

Both the disputants are men of some education and ability. The Clergyman is an orthodox, serious, and amiable man; and there is much of candour and good sense in his Unitarian adversary. The Editor professes to send their correspondence to the press, "giving the whole faithfully without comment, without altering a word or syllable;" and it is but fair to add that "the internal evidence," as he anticipates, is a voucher for the correctness of his representation.

Both parties acquiesce in the fundamental position, that truth of doctrine is to be gained from Scripture by each person for himself; and here lies the *πρώτον ψεῦδος* of the controversy, which in consequence becomes a trial of *strength* between the two individuals. The (so-called) Unitarian claims the right of assuming that—

"The Protestant Church says that the Gospel is addressed to *every individual*; and I say that he, who does not use his most serious and powerful understanding in endeavouring rightly to comprehend it, hides his best talent, instead of improving it."—p. 32.

The Clergyman responds as follows:—

"As to the duty of free inquiry, it is impossible for any one to advocate it more entirely than I do, only let Scripture authority be paramount. But, if any one tampers with Scripture, . . . then, be he friend or foe, I will join in reprobating such conduct."—p. 51.

Now these statements are true in one sense, false in another, and in this consists the fallacy of the reasoning. If by "the Gospel" the (so-called) Unitarian means the text of Scripture without note or comment, it is not true that this is "addressed to every individual;" but, unless he assumes this, it does not at all follow that "he, who does not use his most serious and powerful understanding in endeavouring to comprehend it, hides his best talent." Surely "the Gospel" which is "addressed to every individual" is the Gospel as *dispensed by primitive teaching*, as we shall show in the sequel, and this does not require "the powerful understanding" of any one. The true sense of Scripture, *as regards all high theological points*, has been determined by an unerring authority from the beginning. Again, it is a mistake in our clerical controversialist, to "advocate the duty of free inquiry." Those, of course, who are competent to the task may fairly inquire whether the teaching received in the Church from the first is, in matter of fact, Apostolic, as they may inquire whether the New Testament be the writing of Apostles and Evangelists; but *unless* they have first examined and disproved its claim to be so considered, they have so far no duty of free inquiry upon the text of Scripture. It will be observed that, in so saying, we are advancing no pretensions in behalf of the Clergy, as such, to the power of interpreting Scripture more than in behalf of the laity; we subject them both to an existing Apostolical teaching, explanatory of Scripture.

But the "Layman" goes further. Not only does he consider that we have no existing records of Apostolic teaching but those preserved in the Canon, but he seems most preposterously to think that St. Paul *never taught his converts orally*, that he instructed them only through his extant epistles. He takes this strange position for granted, and founds upon it an argument against the doctrine of our Lord's divinity. He asks—

"Can I believe that concerning this Jesus, whom the Apostles so preached" [i. e. as being a man, viz. in the book of Acts] "year after year to Jews and Gentiles, professing their inspiration, and express commission to teach, saying that they had taught all the Gospel, it was afterwards, *for the first time*, revealed, in a letter written by one of them to a Church he had established in a heathen country," [alluding to Rom. ix. 5,] "(and in this letter, not by direct declaration of the writer, but incidentally, by way of allusion in a parenthesis,) that He was the very and eternal God?"—p. 70.

Strange, indeed, that any religionists should be able to satisfy themselves with so unnatural and meagre a view of the actual propagation of the Gospel! Yet it is parallel to an observation of

Mr. Abbot, the American, that our Saviour was under the "dis-advantage" of having "no press," whereby to act upon "the different portions of the community."

Again—

"It is to me inconceivable that the Apostle could possibly, in the winding up of a sentence in an epistle, *intend to reveal* the astonishing doctrine that Christ was God; that He who said to him, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest,' should ever have added, 'I am the God of the universe, who took upon myself the form of a created being;' and that the Apostle, having preached Christ crucified and risen, should, *after years of such preaching*, bring out this revelation *in so cursory and elliptical a manner*."—p. 129.

It is inconceivable, doubtless, and incredible that he should have brought out a new and stupendous truth for the first time "in so cursory and elliptical a manner;" but then there is an explanation which the "Layman" overlooks. Perhaps it was *not* for the first time; this surely is *as* probable as that "God over all" in Rom. ix. 5, does not apply to Christ. Perhaps whoever converted the Romans had *taught* them this doctrine by word of mouth, as human beings might do now-a-days, and perhaps St. Paul knew it. Surely oral instruction is not one of modern "advantages," as Mr. Abbot would term them, as well as "the press."

But let us observe how the Clergyman, a sensible and well-instructed man, replies to his opponent. We do not find that he any where expresses surprise at the unwarrantable assumption above exposed; and in replying to the argument founded thereon he most curiously flutters about what we deem the real state of the case without ever lighting upon or touching it.

Withstood in his criticism, he appeals to the belief of the early Church; and quotes from Irenæus and Tertullian, whose "testimonies are of some authority in showing" the Layman's "notion to be erroneous."—(pp. 95, 96.) Presently he says, "I have shown by quotations from Irenæus and Tertullian, that the primitive Christians understood it in the sense we attach to it."—(p. 107.) This is promising—he is now in the right track. Alas! he raises only to disappoint our hopes. One should think, before he appealed to the primitive Church, he ought to have ascertained *why* its testimony tells for a certain interpretation of Scripture. The plain reason is this, that it comes close upon the Apostles, and so is more likely to convey their meaning; in other words, it has a certain Apostolic authority in explaining Scripture; and, in consequence, is a source of Christian truth in some sense independent of Scripture, a guide to a certain extent superseding the need of

private judgment. If it have not this authority and on this account, it is no more than the opinion of any other men, and quite irrelevant in the dispute. Almost as reasonably might the Clergyman require his brother to yield to his own interpretation as to Irenæus's, if that Father's proximity to the Apostles has no weight in the question, except indeed that a second opinion corroborates a first. Nevertheless, in spite of all this, he does not fully understand *why* he quoted Irenæus. The Layman boldly says—

“Your quotations from Irenæus and Tertullian prove that the now received construction existed in their time and was received by them; in other words, that they were Trinitarians, and this is all.”—p. 130.

The Clergyman, in his reply to this plain avowal, not only misses the true force of his own argument, but suggests a novel basis for it, viz. that *since creeds did not exist in the primitive Church*, (a position running counter both to fact and to the necessities of his argument,) the primitive belief in the doctrine of the Trinity is an evidence of what is the true sense of Scripture, as witnessed by unbiassed and unprejudiced judgments. He says—

“It is difficult to find persons in these times who have never heard of creeds before they read the Bible; but it appears to me, that the most satisfactory way of ascertaining the truth of your remark, will be to observe what doctrines those persons found in the Bible, who certainly *could have their minds prejudiced by no creed*, save that which they received from the mouth of the Apostles, or which they learned from the inspired writings.”—p. 195.

In this extract let us observe carefully the clause, “*save that which they received from the mouth of the Apostles.*” The writer not only “burns,” he has the truth almost in his hands; yet, as his whole argument plainly evinces, he scarcely has gained it, but he lets it go again. The notion of an apostolical creed authoritatively interpreting Scripture is altogether above him. He continues—

“Let us next see what Clement of Rome believed, *while as yet unschooled by creeds and articles*, &c. . . . Trying Ignatius by the same test, we find him, &c. . . . As to the *object* I had in view in quoting these passages, since I find that Barnabus, Clement, and Ignatius, *without creed preceding*, arrived at the same *conclusion* that I have, namely, that Christ was God, and also the Creator of the world, I am little inclined to distrust that ‘orthodox education’ to which you seem to attribute the *inferences* I draw from the study of the Scriptures.”—p. 196.

What follows, however, shows he *has* another reason for quoting the Fathers; viz. to make it clear *they cannot be used against him*. Dr. Priestley had pretended to assign the *date* of the first corruptions of the Church's doctrine. “Justin Martyr is the first writer who mentions the miraculous conception.”—(*Hist. Early Op.*

vol. iv. p. 107.) Our controversialist meets this assertion; and is employed accordingly, not in showing that the tradition of the Trinity is apostolic, but that it is *not* Justin Martyr's.

His inadequate notion of the primitive creed has already been shown. But one or two extracts in addition will be in point:—

“ We say, reason from Scripture, and expound Scripture by comparing it with itself, instead of with *the dogmas of men* ; and this is the appeal I wish every where to be made.”—p. 115.

“ I assert that neither the Church of England nor I have ever required persons to take their creeds for granted, or forbidden the unbiassed comparison of them with the words of Scripture The eighth article of our Church says, ‘ The three creeds ought thoroughly to be received and believed.’ And why? because the Church says so? No; but because ‘ they may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture.’ The word of God is the test by which we pronounce they are to be tried, &c.”—p. 185—187.

All this is most true, but not the whole truth. It is most true that Scripture is the sole verification of the creeds, as of all professed Apostolical traditions whatever; but it is as true that the creeds are the legitimate exposition of Scripture doctrine. Revealed truth is guaranteed by the union of the two, the creeds at once appealing to Scripture, and developing it. To take Scripture as the *guide* in matters of doctrine is as much a mistake as to take the Apostolical Tradition as the *rule*. What is written is a safeguard to what is unwritten; what is unwritten is a varied *comment* on a (necessarily) limited *text*. The reason of the Clergyman's misapprehension is obvious. He is hampered by the ultra-Protestantism falsely ascribed to our Articles. At the time they were drawn up, the rights of Scripture, as the test of Tradition, were disparaged; and therefore they contain a protest in its behalf. Were they drawn up now, it would be necessary to introduce a protest in behalf of Tradition, as indeed incidentally occurs even as it is, in the famous clause of the 20th Article, which declares that “ the Church,” *i. e.* Catholic, “ has *authority* in controversies of faith,” viz. as being the steward of Apostolical teaching. However, the circumstance that the direct statements of the Articles are mainly in defence of the authority of Scripture, has given specious ground to the school of Ultra-Protestantism to assert that it is a sufficient *guide* as well as an *ultimate appeal*, and that each individual may put what sense he pleases upon it, instead of submitting to that one sense to which the Church has testified from the first, in matter of fact. We see the consequences in the controversy before us. Our orthodox disputant has to argue points which have been ruled in his favour

centuries upon centuries ago, as if inquiry was never to have an end. He is obliged to have recourse to grammatical criticism, to consult Dr. Elmsley, in the Bodleian, about the meaning of particles (p. 48), and after all his toil is met with the candid and perplexing admission on the part of his opponent, that he does not think it necessary to rest his faith on any one "certain sentence in a letter written by an Apostle."—(p. 65.) He is obliged to look about for philosophical evidence, and fortifies his scheme or doctrine by the shallow and dangerous argumentations of Mr. Erskine. After all, he refers the reception of the orthodox doctrine to the influence of the Holy Ghost, vouchsafed to the individual student of Scripture; a position which, of course, dispenses with the necessity of any formal proof of the doctrine at all.

At the same time, consistently or inconsistently with this last belief, but in truth betraying a conviction of the insufficiency of his own arguments for the conversion of another, he condemns (though reluctantly) the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed, as investing with undue sanctions mere deductions made by the human intellect from the text of Scripture.

"Nothing that I have advanced upon the subject of the Athanasian Creed is, as I conceive, in the least degree inconsistent with my joining in the sentiment of Tillotson and wishing it removed from our Church service. If I were called upon to give my vote upon the subject, it would be for its omission; but this would not all imply that I felt less uneasiness as to the future salvation of those who deny the Lord that bought them; nor do I see how the entertaining such fears necessarily leads to any breach of charity."—p. 108.

We do not set much by this salvo, which seems to us but the protest of true Christian feeling against the latitudinarian conclusions at which the intellect had arrived. Is it indeed possible, —we do not say possible in the way of logical consistency, but is it possible in matter of fact, and in the case of men in general, —to believe that the doctrine of the Trinity is a mere human view of Scripture passages, and yet necessary to be believed in order to salvation? Does not, in consequence, the theory that Scripture only is to be the guide of Protestants, lead for certain to liberalism? We do not, indeed, for an instant suppose that any clear and unprejudiced reasoner could help seeing that the Catholic doctrine really is in Scripture, and that, therefore, the denial of it incurs the anathema therein declared against unbelievers; still, while belief in the document is made the first thing, and belief in the doctrine but the second, (as this theory would have it,) it inevitably follows in the case of the multitude, who are not

clear-headed or unprejudiced, that the definition of a Christian will be made to turn, not on faith in the doctrine, but on faith in the document, and Unitarianism will come to be thought, not indeed true, but as if not unreasonable, and not necessarily dangerous. And here we take leave of a work which cannot but give pain to all who sympathise in our own views, the pain of seeing one who sincerely holds the truth of the Gospel, so little conscious of the ground on which he holds it as to be unable to instruct a brother in error.

The argument for the existence of a known Apostolical Tradition on the subject of the Trinity, and therefore an unerring interpreter of Scripture so far, which has been taken for granted in the above remarks, was briefly stated in our January number in a review of Mr. Blanco White's late work. We then expressed an intention of treating the subject more fully than our limits admitted at the time, and we have now a fit opportunity of redeeming our pledge. That writer, it may be recollected, entirely dismissed the notion of any existing Apostolical interpretation of the sacred text, and maintained, on the contrary, that Scripture has no authorized interpreter of any kind, and that dogmatic statements are not part of the revelation. This is the ground long ago taken by Chillingworth and Locke; nor would Mr. Blanco White think we paid a bad compliment to himself to remark it. He would, of course, maintain that all clear-headed reasoners on the popular Protestant basis must necessarily proceed onwards to his own latitudinarian conclusions, if they are but fair to their own minds, and free from the prejudices of education, and the inducements of interest. He would maintain that what is called "Bible religion" and the imposition of dogmatic confessions were irreconcilable with each other, except in a system, (if it deserved the name,) which was imposed by the law and intimately bound up with the security and well-being of the community. And thus he would account both for the acquiescence of the majority in what is in itself absurd, and the recurrence of the same objections and arguments, from time to time, on the part of men of more independent and enlarged minds. In consequence, he would rather exult than otherwise in finding the following passages in Chillingworth and others, anticipating his recent publication.

"Certainly," says Chillingworth, "if Protestants be faulty in this matter," (playing the Pope,) "it is for doing it too much, and not too little. This presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the

general words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences together, under the equal penalty of death and damnation; this vain conceit, that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God; this deifying of our own interpretations, and tyrannous enforcing them upon others; this restraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty wherein Christ and the Apostles left them, is, and hath been the only fountain of all the schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal: the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which (as I said before) tears into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels and members of Christ: 'ridente Turcâ nec dolente Judæo.' Take away these walls of separation and all will quickly be one."—*Religion of Protestants*, iv. 17.

In like manner Locke:—

"When they have determined the holy Scriptures to be the only foundation of faith, they nevertheless lay down certain propositions as fundamental, which are not in the Scripture, and because others will not acknowledge these additional opinions of theirs, nor build upon them, as if they were necessary and fundamental, they therefore make a separation in the Church; either by withdrawing themselves from others, or expelling the others from them. Nor does it signify any thing for them to say, that their confessions and symbols are agreeable to Scripture, and to the analogy of faith. For if they be conceived in the express words of Scripture, there can be no question about them . . . but if they say that the articles which they require to be professed, are consequences deduced from the Scripture, it is undoubtedly well done of them, who believe and profess such things as seem unto them so agreeable to the rule of faith. But it would be very ill done to obtrude those things upon others, unto whom they do not seem to be the indubitable doctrines of the Scripture. This only I say, that however clearly we may think this or the other doctrine to be deduced from Scripture, we ought not therefore to impose it upon others, as a necessary article of faith, because we believe it to be agreeable to the rule of faith. I cannot but wonder at the extravagant arrogance of those men, who think that they themselves can explain things, necessary to salvation, more clearly than the Holy Ghost, the eternal and infinite wisdom of God."—*Letter concerning Toleration*, *fin.*

And Hoadly, in his *Life of Dr. S. Clarke*, speaking of him and his opponents in the Trinitarian question,—

"Let me add this one word more, that since men of such thought and such learning have shown the world in their own

example, how widely the most honest inquirers after truth may differ upon such subjects; this, methinks, should a little abate our mutual censures, and a little take off from our positiveness about the necessity of explaining, in this or that one determinate sense, the ancient passages relating to points of so sublime a nature."

The argument contained in these extracts stands thus: "Scripture is the sole informant of religious truth; there is no infallible interpreter of Scripture, therefore every man has a right to interpret it for himself, and no one may impose his own interpretation on another." If it be objected that learning, scholarship, judgment, and the like, conduce to the understanding of this as of any other ancient book, it is replied, that true as this may be, these qualifications are on all sides of the doctrinal controversy, there being no opinion entertained by any party which has not been advocated at one time or another by confessedly learned, scholarlike, judicious, and able men. This being the case, no one has a right to say that his own opinion is important to any one besides himself, but is bound to tolerate all other creeds by virtue of the very principle on which he has leave to form his own. The imposition, therefore, of dogmatic confessions on others by any set of religionists, is inferred to be an encroachment upon the Christian liberty of their brethren, who have in turn a right to their own private judgment upon the meaning of the Scripture text. Such is the latitudinarian argument.

Now we might put it to the common sense and manly understanding of any number of men taken at random, whether this, at first sight, is not a very strange representation, and such as they would never use in any ordinary matter of importance, any business they took an interest in or were earnest about. Surely no one in a confidential situation, on receiving instructions from his principal, which he could not altogether understand, would think himself at liberty to put any sense he pleased on them, without the risk of being called to account for doing so. He would take it for granted, that whether the instructions given were obscure or not, yet that they were intended to have a meaning, that they had one and one only meaning; and in proportion as he considered he had mastered it, he could not but also consider fellow-agents wrong who took a different view of it; and in proportion as he considered the instruction important, would he be distressed and alarmed at witnessing their neglect of his own interpretation. He might, indeed, if it so happened, doubt about the correctness of his own opinion, but he never would think it a matter of indifference whether he was right or wrong, he would never think

that two persons could go on contentedly and comfortably together who took opposite views of their employer's wishes. Now all this fairly applies to the Scripture disclosures concerning matters of faith. First, it is plain, that faith is therein insisted on as an important condition of salvation; next, it is faith in certain heavenly and unseen truths; and this faith is expressly said to be "one," and is guarded by an anathema upon those who reject it. Now let us ask the disciples of Latitudinarianism *how* do they understand, in what assignable manner do they fulfil, the passages in which all this is conveyed? *What* is the doctrine therein spoken of, and belief in which is pronounced to be necessary for divine favour? Does it not consist of certain mysterious truths, and these undeniably propounded in the form of dogmas, (as in the beginning of St. John's Gospel,) so as utterly to preclude the notion of faith being but an acceptable temper of mind or character? And if so, is it not perfectly wild to imagine that knowledge of these doctrines is altogether unattainable? Can we conceive the allwise Governor of man to have made a solemn declaration of a doctrine which, after all, is so obscurely expressed, that one sense of it is not more obvious and correct than another? Is it conceivable, that he should have pronounced a certain faith necessary to salvation, yet that faith should vary with individual minds, and be in each case only what each person happened to think, so that all that was necessary was to *believe* in his own *opinion*? These strong arguments in favour of the determinateness and oneness of the doctrinal revelation contained in Scripture, can only be met by appealing to the fact that men do take different views of it; but this surely proves nothing; no more than the vicious or secular lives of the majority of men are a proof that one line of conduct is as pleasing to the Creator as another. No one denies that the revealed doctrines *may* be understood variously; but whether this possibility arises from God's indifference to such variety, or answers the purposes of a moral probation (which is the Catholic mode of accounting for it), is not at all decided by the mere fact of its existing.

But here Mr. Blanco White meets us with an objection which strikes at the root of our entire system. He is not content with denying the existence of an unerring guide for determining the theology of Scripture; he boldly advances a step, and maintains that no form of human language can possibly reveal in one certain sense those doctrines which we commonly suppose revealed; that words are necessarily the representatives of things experienced, and are simply words, and nothing but words, and not the symbols of definite and appropriate ideas, when used of things belonging to

the next world. Now let it be observed clearly that this objection brings us upon quite a new ground; here it is that this ingenious writer seems to add something to the arguments of his predecessors in the same philosophy. Hitherto the position maintained by latitudinarians has chiefly been, not that Scripture may not possibly reveal to us heavenly truths in any measure, but that we cannot be sure that we individually have correctly ascertained them. The existence of an authorized interpreter, not the possibility of the revelation itself, has been questioned. But Mr. Blanco White denies of unseen truths, as well that they *can* be, as that they *have* been revealed to us under any one determinate view. Under these circumstances we shall claim of the reader the liberty of some little discursiveness, not so much, however, with the view of refuting an evident paradox, as of illustrating the subject itself.

We call it a paradox, for if anything is plain, it is that Scripture does from time to time speak dogmatically on heavenly subjects. The writer in question, tells us that nothing respecting these subjects can be conveyed in language so definitely, as not to admit of the maintenance of the most contradictory theories respecting its meaning. With what *purpose*, then, does St. John, for instance, propose for our belief, "The Word was with God and was God," if nothing definite is gained by saying it, if the matter is left as vague as if he had not said? He cannot but have meant to convey something such, that it could not be anything else; and it is surely a paradox, to use a mild word, to maintain that Scripture attempts that which it cannot possibly accomplish.

It is a paradox for another reason. Would Mr. Blanco White deny that Christians of the English Church at this day, or again, that the Catholics of the fourth and fifth centuries, had embraced one certain view of the doctrine of the Trinity, and not another? We do not say how far definite, complete, consistent; but still, so far forth as they had any view, a view of a certain kind, ascertainable, communicable, capable of being recorded? It seems hard to deny it, yet deny it he must, or else it will follow that human language is able to convey, circulate and transmit one certain sense of a mystery—a position which he denies in the abstract.

But this is not all. Human language, he says, cannot stand for *ideas* concerning the Divine Nature, i. e. for definite conceptions such as may be imparted to *us*. Let us, for argument's sake, grant it. Yet even then, at least it may stand for the real objects themselves. Nothing is more common in the usage of the world than what logicians call *words of second intention*, which mean nothing at all to those who are not conversant with the sciences which employ them for their own purposes. Almighty God

might surely put His own meaning on human words, if it may be reverently said, and might honour them by making them speak mysteries, though not conveying thereby any notion at all to us. Here then at once we are admitted to the privilege of a dogmatic creed, in spite of Mr. Blanco White. Granting we do not *at all* understand our own words; nor did the Apostles when they were told their Lord should "rise from the dead:" they questioned *what it meant*. Still it is something after all to be intrusted with words which have a precious meaning, which we shall one day know, though we know it not now. Is it nothing to have a pledge of the next world? to have that given us which involves the intention of future revelations on God's part, unless His work is to be left unfinished? We will be bold to say that this is no slight point gained, if nothing else follows; a principle of mysteriousness, a feeling of deep reverence, of solemn expectation and waiting, is at once introduced into our religion. Allow, for argument's sake, that we have no data for disputing about the interpretation of the Scripture enunciations; well, then, we have an obligation for that very reason to preserve them jealously, to regard them awfully. Is it nothing that human words have been taken into the dialect of angels, and stand for objects above human thought? Is it nothing that when thus consecrated for a supernatural purpose, they have been given back to us to know and gaze upon, even though the outward form of them be the same as before? Let all "denominations of Christians" unite as far as this, to set apart and honour the very formulæ contained in Scripture, keeping silence and forbidding all comment upon them, and they will have gone a considerable way towards the adoption of the Catholic *spirit* respecting them.

But again. We are told that human words *cannot* convey to us any idea, one and the same, of heavenly objects. Supposing it; but what then are we to say about the doctrines of natural religion? Has all the world gone wrong for ages in supposing it had a meaning in saying that God is *infinite* and *eternal*? Yet what known objects do these words stand for? It will be answered that they stand only for negative ideas; that we know what is finite, and we say that the Almighty is *not* finite either in His attributes, His essence, or His existence. Truly said; but may not we gain just this from the doctrinal formulæ of the Gospel, whatever else we gain beside, viz. the *exclusion* of certain notions from our idea of the Son and Spirit? Thus when Christ is said to be the *Son* of God, we conclude thence that He is *not* a creature; *not* of a created essence, *dissimilar* from all created natures. Whether this be the right interpretation of the word *Son*, a fair

inference from it, is another question; the instance is adduced here only with a view of exemplifying what is at least the negative force of the Scripture figures concerning divine objects. So again, the words "in the bosom of the Father," surely may suffice to exclude from our theology the notion of the Son being distinct in substance and existence from the Almighty Father. We assert it is possible that human language, as used in Scripture, should do as much as this,—it may make the truth of doctrine lie in one direction, not in another, whether there be an unerring arbiter of controversies or not,—it may have a *legitimate* meaning, so as to involve readers in guilt if they reject it, and make them amenable hereafter for not having had an unerring and sufficient judge of the Scripture text in their own breasts. And let it be observed that one great portion of the Catholic symbols and expositions actually is engaged in this department of limitation and admonition. Thus, in the creed of the Nicene Council, the anathema was attached to those who rejected these negative attributes of our Lord, viz. His having *no* beginning, being *not* of a created essence, and being *unchangeable*. Again; the following remarks of a recent writer on the conduct of the Fathers in the controversy are altogether in point, the more so as being incidentally introduced into his work. "They did not use these [figures] for more than shadows of sacred truth, symbols *witnessing against* the speculations into which the unbridled intellect fell. Accordingly, they were for a time inconsistent with each other in the minor particulars of their doctrinal statements, *being far more bent on opposing error than forming a theology.*" To the same purpose are the remarks of Gibbon, who thought he was exposing the Catholic creed, when he was really illustrating the foundation of all our doctrine concerning the Divine Nature, whether in natural or revealed religion. "In every step of the inquiry, we are compelled to feel and acknowledge the immeasurable disproportion between the size of the object and the capacity of the human mind. We strive to abstract the notions of time, of space, and of matter, which so closely adhere to all the preceptions of our experimental knowledge. But as soon as we presume to reason of infinite substance, of spiritual generation, *as often as we deduce any positive conclusions from a negative idea*, we are involved in darkness, perplexity, and inevitable contradiction."—*Gibbon*, ch. xxi. Yet, strange to say, this very author, who so unhesitatingly blames positive statements concerning the mysterious essence of God, shortly after indirectly assails the Catholics at Nicæa for being more eager to denounce the Arians than to explain the formula of the Homousion, and for allowing the Sabel-

lians to shelter themselves under it, so that they would help them in subduing those who denied it. We do not by any means allow the correctness of this charge, but at least it represents the Catholics as doing the very thing which he had shortly before by implication recommended, confining their symbol to the expression of "a negative idea," and excluding from it "any positive conclusions." Gibbon probably was not aware (unless he was too much prejudiced to admit) that the doctrine he puts forward in the above extract with so much pomp and authoritativeness, was a principle taken for granted by the Catholic Fathers, and acted upon in their discussions. St. John Damascene, (e. g.) after speaking of Almighty God as immaterial and spiritual, proceeds, "But even this attribute gives us no conception of His *substance*, (*ἐσία*,) any more than His eternity, unchangeableness, and the rest; for these declare not what He is, but what He is not; whereas, when we speak of the substance of any being, we have to say what it is, not what it is not. However, as relates to God, *it is impossible to say what He is as to His substance*; and it is rather more to the purpose to contrast Him with all beings (*ὄντων*) when we speak of Him. The Divine Nature, then, is infinite and incomprehensible; all we can know about it is, that it is not to be known; and *whatever positive statements we make concerning God, relate not to His nature, but to the accompaniments of His nature*. For instance, where one calls Him good, just, wise, and so on, one does not speak of His nature, but of what belongs to it."* It is clear, then, that in all their discussions concerning the *ἐσία*, *ὁμοέσιον*, and the other subjects of the Trinitarian controversy, the Fathers started with the admission that they were arriving after all at no positive conclusions on the subject, only guarding against the introduction of error.

These observations seem to have carried us as far as this; first, that whereas the New Testament contains dogmatic statements concerning the Divine Nature, proposes them for our acceptance, and guards them with anathemas, it is clearly our duty to put them forth formally, whether we be able in our present state to attach a distinct meaning to them or not, just as the Blessed Virgin pondered our Lord's words, or the Apostles His prophecy of His resurrection, or the Prophets what "the Spirit of Christ signified," without understanding what they received. Next it would appear that these statements, however inadequate to express the divine realities, yet may convey to us at least some negative information about them, whatever else they convey,—in fact, may reveal to us the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation

* De Fid. Orthod. i. 4.

in the same sense in which natural religion teaches us the truths connected with the being and attributes of God; so that we are under no necessity of giving up our interpretations of the Scripture statements, unless we are bound to go further, unless we are to be forced from our notions of religion altogether—forced into Pantheism, or some more avowed form of atheistical speculation.

But we do not mean to stop here, we mean to prove the existence of an authorized interpreter of Scripture, as well as the intrinsic definiteness of its text. The obvious remark on what has hitherto been said, would be, that it justified the use, not the imposition, of extra-scriptural statements; whereas some of the articles of the creed are not simply deduced from Scripture, but are made the terms of Communion, invested with the terrors of the invisible world, and so raised from human comments into the rank of inspired truth. Let us hear Dr. Hampden* on this subject, a writer who is here introduced, not from any wish to come into collision with him, but because it has fallen to his lot to state objections to Catholic Truth in a more distinct shape than they have been found in the works of Churchmen for some time. “The real causes of separation,” he says, “are to be found in that confusion of theological and moral truth with religion, which is evidenced in the profession of different sects. Opinions on religious matters are regarded as identical with the objects of faith; and the zeal which belongs to dissentients in the latter, is transferred to the guiltless differences of fallible judgments. Whilst we agree in the canon of Scripture, in the very words, for the most part, from which we learn what are the objects of faith, we suffer disunion to spread among us, through the various interpretations suggested by our own reasonings on the admitted facts of Scripture. We introduce theories of the Divine Being and attributes,—theories of human nature and of the universe—principles drawn from the various branches of human philosophy—into the body itself of revealed wisdom. And we then proceed to contend for these unrevealed representations of the wisdom of God, as if it were that very wisdom as it stands forth confessed in his own living oracles. ‘The wisdom that is from above’ is at once ‘pure’ and ‘gentle.’ Surely it has no resemblance to that dogmatical and sententious wisdom which theological controversy has created.”—*Observations on Religious Dissent*, pp. 7, 8.

Now we quote this passage for the sake of meeting it; it contains a fair argument, which ought to be met. If a Christian is pained at it, as he may well be, it is not on account of the argument itself, or the putting it forward, or the necessity of encountering

* This article was written before Dr. Hampden's appointment to the Divinity Professorship at Oxford, and has been in type since March last.

it, but to see an author so confident of its correctness as to allow himself in consequence to speak evil of that which others consider as the very word of God. Those who consider that the Creeds are the word of God, as truly, though not in the same sense, as the Scripture, and derived in the same way from transmission from the Apostles, of course will be shocked at finding their expressions treated as a "dogmatical and sententious wisdom." It is surely not modest or becoming in any one, so to connect his own opinions with the truth itself, as to assume that what *he* does not consider as the true view of the case, may be at once treated with contumely; it is, in fact, but a specimen in Dr. H. of the very error which he conceives he has detected in the Church Catholic itself. We suppose he would object to a controversialist who, in arguing against a Calvinist, maintained, that if his opponent's view was the true one, the course of Providence was unjust and tyrannical. He would protest against hazarding the mercy and equity of the Divine dealings on the accident of the correctness of any human reasonings. On somewhat a similar ground we are offended at the above passage; not for the argument itself, which he is at liberty to put forth if he will; but at the lightness (as we view it) of his expressions about what others consider sacred statements, expressions which are not excusable, except a line of argument be true which we think a fallacy. "Let not him that girdeth on his harness, boast himself as he that putteth it off;" and let not the writer now in question assume the very position in debate, lest haply he be found to be scoffing against that very wisdom, which, "dogmatical and sententious" or not, has come by direct transmission independent of Scripture, from the Apostles themselves.

We say, from the Apostles; and thus we advance a claim, which if substantiated, overturns the argument of Mr. Blanco White, Dr. Hampden, Chillingworth, Hoadly, Locke, and the rest from its very foundation. The doctrinal statements of the creeds are not to be viewed as mere deductions from Scripture, any more than the historical statements of those creeds,—the article of the Homousion any more than that of the Resurrection; but as the appropriate expressions and embodying of apostolical teaching, known to be such, and handed down in the Church as such from age to age. If this be so, it is in vain to argue about "various interpretations of Scripture," "pious opinions" and "theories" upon "facts," and of "differences of fallible judgments;" it is equally vain to talk of "hieroglyphics casting shadows" and "metaphors explanatory of metaphors," and so forth. These "interpretations" turn out to be authoritative and original statements; these "opinions" are doctrines; these so-called secondary metaphors are primary symbols given by Apostles or ex-

pressive of their known teaching. Will it be here said that now in turn we are boasting before our proof? No: we are complaining, and on this score, that this view which we consider the true one, has not attracted the attention either of Mr. Blanco White or Dr. Hampden.

This is the more remarkable in the case of the latter of these two writers, for he approaches the view in question, but strangely enough in one who has a name for learning, he notices it only to misunderstand it. He speaks thus of the doctrine of the Church of Rome. "In the Roman Catholic Church . . . the question" (whether conclusions from Scripture have in themselves the authoritative force of real divine truth) "is formally decided in the affirmative, by the authority assigned to tradition in conjunction with Scripture; for *tradition is nothing more* than expositions of the text of Scripture, *reasoned out by the Church* and embodied in a code of doctrine."—p. 4. This, we confess, is to us information; as we suspect it would be to Bellarmine also or any other Roman controversialist. We suspect that they would altogether disavow all claim to impose mere deductions from Scripture, as divine truths, in spite of their assumed infallibility in matters of doctrine. Rather it is one of their charges against Protestant communions, that these do impose, as matters of faith, what after all they believe only on the assurance of private judgment. They profess that their traditions exist quite independently of Scripture; that had Scripture never been written, they would have existed still, and that they form a collateral not a subordinate source of information to the Church. We must repeat our utter surprise at such a statement as the above, from such a quarter, when even the popular work of Bishop Jebb would have warned Dr. Hampden of its incorrectness. "The Church of Rome maintains," he says in his *Essay on the Peculiar Character of the English Church*, "not only that there are two rules of belief, but these two rules are *co-ordinate*; that there is an *unwritten*, no less than a written *word of God*; and that the authority of the former is *alike definitive with the authority of the latter*." Reluctant as we may be to set before our readers a truth as plain as the fact of the existence of the Roman Church itself,—its maintenance of the *intrinsic* and *independent* authority of the unwritten Word,—yet we must insist upon it when writers indulge themselves in so extravagant a liberty of speculation. Let us turn to the words of Bellarmine. "*Totalis regula fidei*," he says, (*De Verb. Dei non Script. 12*), *est Verbum Dei, sive revelatio Dei Ecclesiæ facta, quæ dividitur in duas regulas partiales, Scripturam et traditionem.*" And he has a chapter on the tests by which we ascertain what traditions are apostolical. Again, among the uses of tradition he places

that of *interpreting* Scripture doctrine. “*Sæpissime Scriptura ambigua et perplexa est, ut nisi ab aliquo, qui errare non possit, explicetur, non possit intelligi; igitur sola non sufficit. Exempla sunt plurima: nam æqualitas divinarum personarum, processio Spiritus Sancti à Patre et Filio, ut ab uno principio, peccatum originis, descensus Christi ad inferos, et multa similia deducuntur quidem ex sacris litteris, sed non adeo facile, ut si solis pugnandum sit Scripturæ testimoniis, nunquam lites cum protervis finire possint.* Notandum est enim, duo esse in Scripturâ, voces scriptas, et sensum in eis inclusum. . . . Ex his duobus primum habetur ab omnibus; quicunque enim novit litteras, potest legere Scripturas: at secundum non habent omnes, nec possumus in plurimis locis certi esse de secundo, *nisi accedat traditio.*—Ibid. 4. In like manner Bossuet, (Exposition, ch. 17, 18,) “*Jesus Christ having laid the foundation of his Church by preaching, the unwritten word was consequently the first rule of Christianity; and, when the writings of the New Testament were added to it, its authority was not forfeited on that account; which makes us receive with equal veneration all that hath been taught by the Apostles, whether in writing or by word of mouth And a most certain mark that a doctrine comes from the Apostles, is, when all Christian Churches embrace it, without its being in the power of any one to show when it had a beginning Bound inseparably, as we are, to the authority of the Church, by the Scriptures which we receive from her hand, we learn tradition also from her; and by means of tradition the true sense of the Scriptures. For which reason the Church openly professes, that she says nothing from herself; that she invents no new doctrine; she only declares the Divine Revelation, by the interior direction of the Holy Ghost, who is given to her as her teacher.*” Here mention of the third person of the Blessed Trinity is introduced, not as aiding the Church to interpret Scripture, but as guiding her into a right discrimination and application of apostolical tradition. The reader probably is by this time tired of authorities, or we might refer to the words of the Tridentine Decree, upon which the foregoing passages are the comment.* And this matter is perfectly understood by clear-headed men, as Hales and Chillingworth, who, though they deny the fact, yet understand the Roman Church’s assumption, that its tradition comes directly from the Apostles, independently of Scripture; whereas Dr. Hampden

* *Sacro-sancta Tridentina Synodus. . . omnes libros tam veteris quàm novi Testamenti necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Christo vel à Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continuâ successione in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ suscipit et veneratur.*—*Sess. quart.*

has ruled it in half a sentence that “ tradition is *nothing more* than expositions of the text of Scripture, *reasoned out by the Church*, and embodied in a code of doctrine ;” stating what is neither agreeable to the fact nor to the Roman view of it ; for no one will say, for instance, that the doctrine of indulgences either is and is professed by the Romanists to be primarily reasoned out from Scripture. Nay the decree of the Council of Trent expressly says “ Cum potestas conferendi indulgentias à Christo Ecclesiæ concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate, divinitus sibi traditâ, antiquissimis temporibus illa usa fuerit,” &c., not a word being said of any Scripture sanction for the use of them. Indeed this is the very point of difference between the Romanists and ourselves. The English Church no where denies the existence of apostolical traditions, and their authority in the interpretation of Scripture ; so far we do *not* dissent from the Romanists. But what we do deny is the independent and substantive power of tradition in matters of faith, where Scripture is silent,—the right of the Church to impose doctrines on the *mere* authority of tradition, which the Council of Trent has done, for instance, in the above cited decree on indulgences. So that it would seem that Dr. Hampden has not only passed over the question of the apostolicity of the creeds, in which we conceive lies the refutation of his peculiar theory ; but he has actually missed that very point in the Roman Church’s doctrine, in which she differs from our own.

Here we take leave of Dr. H. for the present, and should feel pleasure if we could be saved the necessity of recurring to him. Other objections will be made to the notion of the authority of the creeds, as a contemporaneous comment upon Scripture, which we must try to clear off as expeditiously as we can. When an educated man of the present day first hears it said that the creeds are the expressions of apostolical traditions, he is at once annoyed, and listens with suspicion. Now why is this ? First it is because he has never heard the view stated before, and he feels that doubt which spontaneously rises when the mind is put out of its usual way of thinking. He does not know what the principle may lead to ; he does not see how far it may carry him towards popery ; he does not see its bearings, its limitations, or its grounds. This is all very natural ; yet on second thoughts perhaps he will take heart and be more rational. We say “ more rational,” for’ there are certainly fair grounds of reason, prior to evidence, to desire, nay almost to expect, such an informant as we are offering to him about the meaning of Scripture. Such a guide is surely very much wanted. Scripture is not written in a dogmatic form, though there are dogmatic passages in it ; it contains the portions and tokens of a theological system, without itself being such. It

promises dogmatic statements without fully supplying them. What then is so natural as to suppose that Divine Mercy has somewhere or other supplied this desideratum? and what antecedent improbability is there in the creeds containing the heads and subjects of the teaching required? It is worth remarking, however, that this very character of Scripture, which seems by its form and matter to point at the creeds and the traditionary teaching connected with them as its due complement, has been paradoxically brought as an argument for dispensing with them. Assuming that in Scripture we have the model and type of all Christian teaching, it has been decided, that since the creeds, as being dogmatic, are unlike Scripture, that therefore they are no part of Christianity, which is about as rational as to conclude (according to St. Paul's illustration) that because the eye is not the hand, therefore it is not of the body; or because England has a king, therefore its constitution is a development of the monarchical principle; or that because it has popular institutions, therefore it has no king. We must surely take things as we find them in matter of fact, we must deny ourselves in theories, (latitudinarian as well as what Dr. Hampden calls "scholastic,") and use *à priori* reasonings not to prove but to recommend our conclusions. Moreover, in the present instance, it is humbly conceived that antecedent probability, as far as it goes, is for, not against, the apostolical authority of the creeds. Dr. Hampden came into our minds in this last sentence, because here too he has indulged in a seeming paradox as on other points. Speaking in depreciation of dogmatic statements, he uses an argument which tells so fatally against himself, that readers must look over it twice to be sure that they have not mistaken his meaning. "I ask," he says in his Bampton Lectures, in a passage which has been much quoted of late, "whether it is *likely* that an Apostle would have adopted the form of an epistolary communication for imparting mysterious propositions to disciples with whom he enjoyed the opportunity of personal intercourse, and to whom he had already 'declared the whole counsel of God?'"—p. 374. This argument, let it be observed, is to go to prove that Christianity is not dogmatic, because Scripture is not; and we do not know which most to admire—the boldness of the main position, or the felicity of a mode of handling it, which oversets the reasoning on which it is founded. It presents a curious contrast to the reasoning of the present Archbishop of Dublin in his Essay on Creeds; who advocates the same theory on the ground that there is no Apostolical teaching now extant, thus failing characteristically, not in the reasoning, which is most intelligible, but in the matter of fact.

It will serve at once to explain and to defend the position we

have taken up against Dr. Hampden, to express ourselves in the language of the learned and soberminded prelate, who is at present in the possession of the see of Lincoln. "If we mistake not the signs of the times," he observes in his work upon Tertullian, "the period is not far distant when the whole controversy between the English and Romish Churches will be revived, and all the points in dispute again brought under review. Of those none is more important than the question respecting tradition; and it is therefore most essential that they who stand forth as the defenders of the Church of England should take a correct and rational view of the subject, the view in short which was taken by our divines at the Reformation. *Nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all tradition.* . . . What our reformers opposed was the notion that men must, upon the *mere* authority of tradition, receive, *as necessary to salvation*, doctrines *not contained in Scripture* . . . With respect to the particular doctrines, in defence of which the Roman Catholics appeal to tradition, our reformers contended that some were directly at variance with Scripture; and that others, far from being supported by an unbroken chain of tradition from the apostolic age, were of very recent origin, and utterly unknown to the early Fathers . . . In this, as in other instances, they wisely adopted a middle course; they neither bowed submissively to the authority of tradition, nor yet rejected it altogether. We at the present day must tread in their footsteps and imitate their moderation, if we intend to combat our Roman Catholic adversaries with success."—p. 297, ed. 1826. In another place he speaks still more explicitly. "Tertullian," he says, as if citing the statement of a writer he was animadverting on, "appeals to apostolical tradition, to a rule of faith, not *originally* deduced from Scripture, but delivered by the Apostles orally to the Churches which they founded, and regularly transmitted from them to his own time. How, I would ask, is this appeal inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England, which declares *only* that Holy Scripture *contains* all things necessary to salvation? Respecting the source, from which the rule of faith was *originally* deduced, our Church is silent."—p. 587.

Granting, however, there was such an apostolical tradition (*e. g.* concerning the doctrine of the Trinity) it may be a question with many persons whether we at this day know for certain what it was. The Creed indeed bids fairest for being reputed such; but though definite in its articles and of primitive antiquity, a question might arise as to its strict apostolicity. On the other hand it might be plausibly asked, if even the Creed be not for certain of apostolic origin, what doctrinal statements can safely be con-

sidered as such. It may be right therefore in this place to offer some brief remarks on the *relation* existing between the Creed and apostolical tradition; and here again we encounter at once an observation of Dr. Hampden's. He observes that "it will be said by some advocates of our Church that . . . the doctrines expressed in its formularies . . . are derived from the confessors and doctors of the primitive ages of the Church—they have descended to us in pure stream from the fountains of orthodoxy, &c." To this he replies; "Is this correct in matter of fact? Are the doctrines *as expressed in our formularies*, (for this is the point at issue, and not whether the divine truths which they are intended to guard, are the same or not,) precisely those which the primitive Church declared? If we look to the course of controversy we must see, I think, that the dogmas have taken their mould and complexion from the discussions of subsequent periods, until they reached a speculative accuracy of expression to which subsequent discussions could not add."—*Obs.* pp. 23, 24.

Not for the sake of interfering with Dr. Hampden, but for the sake of an important question, we will here say a few words in explanation of this subject; are the dogmatic statements of the Creeds, or are they not, of Apostolic origin? the case seems to be as follows:—

It is quite certain from the writings of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Vincent, not to mention other authorities, that from the times of the Apostles, there was a certain body of doctrine in the Church Catholic called the *dogma fidei* or *depositum* transmitted from bishop to bishop, and taught to every member of it. It was too vast, too minute, too complicated to be put into writing, at least in times of persecution and proselytism; it was for the most part conveyed orally, and the safeguard against its corruption was, first, the unanimity of the various branches of the Church in declaring it; next the canon of Scripture which acted as a touchstone, not indeed measuring it and limiting it, but coinciding with it in all its greater points and verifying both its outlines and occasionally its details also. As regards its outlines this dogma, or *regula fidei*, as it was called, was from the first fixed in a set form of words called the Creed, the articles of which were heads and memoranda of the Church's teaching, and as such were rehearsed and accepted by every candidate for baptism by way of avowing his adherence to that entire doctrine which the Church was appointed to dispense. These articles varied somewhat in the different branches of the Church; but, inasmuch as they were but heads and tokens of the Catholic doctrine, and when developed and commented on implied each other, this argued no difference in the tradition of which they were the formal record. This account of the matter,

if correct, shows us the mistake of considering, as some have done, that the fact of the Creed being the initiatory confession of the Church, involved a latitudinarian principle in primitive times. This is maintained by Episcopius, who argues as if because the words "Son of God" stood nakedly in some of the early creeds, therefore they might allowably be taken in any sense which the humour of individuals imagined, as well as in that one Catholic interpretation in which the Nicene fathers afterwards developed it.* Bishop Bull shows this was not true as regards that high article of doctrine, and the same might be showed of all the rest; so that if one wished a clear and available definition of heresy, perhaps one could not find a better than this, that it is a wilful rejection of any article of the Creed in that sense in which the early Church understood and taught it. And here, by the bye, we have light cast at once on a question which may, for what we know, perplex us in this day before many years are over. It is notorious there are persons in the Church who wish its recognition of baptismal regeneration to be removed. Now inasmuch as one of the articles of the Nicene Creed witnesses to the "one baptism for the remission of sins," and since any how the doctors of the early Church would so explain the less complete form of words which occurs in the Apostles' Creed, "the forgiveness of sins," it follows, if the above view is correct, that to deny baptismal regeneration is *heresy*, and that a Church which indulged its members in such denial would have forfeited its trust and have done much to deprive it of any claim upon our allegiance. But to return to the subject immediately before us:—it would seem from what has been said that the very articles of the Creed are not Apostolic in such a sense that we can pronounce them to be literally spoken by the Apostles; but they are some among a great multitude of statements of a similar kind, none of which indeed can be identified as literally Apostolic, but which altogether go to convey that view which is Apostolic, and might be ascertained to be Apostolic in the same way in which we become acquainted with each others' views in any matter, not relying on this or that expression, but mastering it from the general bearing and scope of each others' conversation; and this is the view to be taken of certain words, as *ὁμοῦσιος*, *θεοτόκος* and the like, which at different times were assumed as the criterion of certain doctrines which required the seal of public authority. They are representations, more or less arbitrary, as the case might be, of the Apostolical tradition on

* "Symbola certe Ecclesiæ ex ipso Ecclesiæ sensu, non ex hæreticorum cerebello exponenda sunt. Symbola Ecclesiæ non tenet, qui aliter quam Ecclesia intelligit."—Bull. Judicium Eccl. Cath. c. 5, § 10.

the subject of them. They were assumed after a careful consideration and ascertaining of the doctrine which they symbolized. Received opinions were compared together, between the Churches, as they might now-a-days. Bishop compared notes with bishop, and brought out his meaning in the clearest and fullest form. This implied time and accurate thought, freedom of discussion, questioning, reviewing, and all not for the sake of forming a new doctrine, but in order to ascertain the old. The next question was how this one and the same sense in which all parts of the Church were found to agree could be best expressed and perpetuated; and the word or phrase selected for the purpose, and generally from the diction of antiquity, became the expression and representative of the Apostolical tradition, without having any special claim above others to be considered of Apostolical origin itself.*

It has taken a long time indeed to clear our ground; but now at length we hope to proceed without impediment to the *proof* of the doctrine which we have been hitherto explaining. After all, it will be asked, is there any ascertainable Apostolical Tradition? Let us see.

First, every one knows that a certain doctrine concerning our Lord's nature is taught *at present* all over the Church, and that this, in matter of fact, was not gained from Scripture in the first instance by the existing generation (though it is fully attested and verified by Scripture), but from the teaching of the generation immediately preceding. This process of transmission and reception has gone on, at least for many centuries; nor is there anything antecedently absurd in the notion, nay it is agreeable to what meets us at first sight, that the process should have been so conducted, independently of Scripture, from the first. Of course, when we come to examine into the course of the history, decisive objections to this supposition may, for what we know, present themselves; but there is nothing in the actual face of things to throw discredit upon it. On the contrary, there is this strong probability *against* the doctrine ever having been strictly *deduced* from Scripture, that it is not sufficiently on the *surface* of the sacred text to force itself as Scriptural upon the observation of men at large. At first sight it is not likely, to say the least, we think no candid man will say it is likely, that the Catholic doctrine, systematized as it is, should be in matter of fact a mere deduction from Scripture, even though it be (as it most surely is) quite consistent with it. To use a familiar illustration, it is like a key to a lock, of independent workmanship, but subordi-

* Vide Vincent. Lerin. Comm. 32 fin.

nate use. We do not say that no acute and subtle mind, no one individual, might not draw it forth and develope it from Scripture as we find it in the Church, nay, add other and more complicated distinctions to it; it is its *general* adoption from so early an age which proves incontrovertibly, that, whether it be by revelation or not, whether it be (as we believe) from the Apostles, or (as others have said) from the Platonists, or Paganism, or in whatever way, it is from sources historically distinct from the written word which is the verification of it. The instances which happen daily of the *differences* of view which take place as to the doctrine, when men, however learned and clearheaded, *do* attempt to deduce from Scripture their "pious opinions," as Dr. Hampden terms them, prove that the knowledge of it which we enjoy does not come from the mere study of Scripture. Let us now approach nearer to this phenomenon and view it at that date, when even heretics will allow it did exist, whatever questions they raise about the earlier centuries, we mean in the fourth century. Assuming that the Church's belief now is the same as its belief then, let us observe what took place in the year 325. At that date, in consequence of a controversy which occurred on the subject of our Lord's Divinity between the bishop of Alexandria and one of his clergy, a council was held of 318 bishops collected from all parts of Christendom. No such general meeting had ever before taken place; no opportunity had before occurred for adjusting their notions one with another. Yet out of this number so collected above 300 agreed in the maintenance of that doctrine which is now known by the title of Orthodox. This is the phenomenon, and on it we make the following remarks.

First, then, let it be observed that no external authority interfered to incline them to the doctrine to which they subscribed. Constantine had originally considered the dispute which led to their meeting as little better than a question of words, and had written to Alexandria to order both parties engaged in it to tolerate each other and keep quiet. On finding however the general opinion before and at the council in favour of orthodoxy, he changed his course, though he abandoned thereby his personal friends, and zealously defended the side professed by the majority. After a few years he gradually changed back again, and exposed the cause of orthodoxy to the revenge of a disappointed faction. Constantius, who succeeded him, took a still more decided part against it. Thus no political influences can be assigned as the cause of the general agreement, such as for instance may be objected to the unanimity at Trent.* On the other hand there

* Or again, as at Ariminum, where (A. D. 359) four hundred bishops *under compulsion from Constantius*, signed a formulary short of the Nicene.

were known and long existing rivalries between the separate Churches which took part in the council. Before this era there had been serious disputes between Rome and Ephesus, Rome and Carthage, Rome and Antioch; and if it be said that the bishop of Rome himself was not at the council, only delegates from him, in the same proportion as his influence did not act there, is it remarkable that he should have so cordially and zealously co-operated in the West in carrying its decrees into effect? Further, there was an old jealousy between Alexandria and Antioch. Moreover, there was at that time a schismatical communion, called the Novatian, of about 70 years standing, spreading through Asia Minor and Africa, as well as Italy; and represented at the council, at Constantine's instance, by one of their bishops. This communion is known to have held the Homousion as zealously as the Church Catholic, and to have afterwards suffered persecution on that account from the Arians. It may be observed that of the two historians of those times, both of whom were laymen, one of them belonged, or at least was inclined to this sect.

In the next place, these fathers at Nicæa did not at all profess to be giving merely their own sense of Scripture; but to be bearing witness to a simple matter of fact, that they had *received* their doctrine from the generation before them, and knew of no other as ever existing in their respective churches. On the contrary, it is observable that the handful of men who advocated Arianism at the Council, did not make any such appeal to an uninterrupted tradition. They did but profess to argue from Scripture; or, if they went further, it was but to say they had been so taught by a certain Presbyter of Antioch, whose disciples they avowed themselves to be. Further than this they did not venture. This contrast is strikingly referred to in one of the treatises of Athanasius. He remarks, with somewhat of point, on the circumstance of the Arians dating one of their Confessions of Faith by the consulate of the current year. "Having composed," he said, "a creed according to their tastes, they headed it with mention of the consul, and the month, and the day; as if to suggest to all men of understanding, that now from the time of Constantius, not before, their faith dates its origin. . . . They say, 'We publish the Catholic faith,' and then they add consulate, month, and day; that, as the prophets marked the period of their histories and their ministries by dates," alluding to Isa. i. 1, and the like, "so they might be accurate in the date of their faith. Nay, I wish they had confined themselves to speak of *their own* faith, for in fact it did then begin, and had let alone the *Catholic* faith; whereas they wrote, not 'Thus we believe,' but 'We publish the Catholic faith.' . . . On the other hand [at

Nicæa] many: as were the framers of the creed, they ventured nothing such as these three or four men have ventured. They did not care to head it with consulate, month, and day; and, whereas about the Easter feast they said, ‘This is the decree,’ they did not use ‘decree’ about the faith, but said, ‘Thus believes the Catholic church;’ nor had they any delay in stating what they believed, *in proof that their notions were not novel, but apostolical*. And what they set down was no discovery of theirs, but the doctrine which was taught by the apostles.”* It will be observed, that in this extract the fact (which to scholars is sufficiently notorious) of the contrast between the Catholics as witnesses, and the Arians as inventors, is assumed by the author as so familiar to his readers, that he is able to taunt even the indifferent proceedings of the latter as retaining the savour of it.

Nor must it be supposed that the doctrine thus appealed to by the Catholics was a mere vague and floating opinion; such as may now exist among ourselves, whether true or false, that the Papists keep no faith with heretics, or that the Bible only is the religion of Protestants. On the contrary, it was a fixed and recognized doctrine, as was above noticed, formally committed to the guardianship of every bishop every where, and by him made over to his successor. There is no mistaking about this: we know that such a depositum existed, and such a *traditio*, or transmission, was formally observed in and from the apostolic age, and we know what the subject of it was. St. John speaks anxiously concerning the duty of guarding in its purity “the doctrine of Christ;” St. Paul of the “one faith;” and St. Jude of “contending for” this one “faith once committed.” If we would know the matter of it, the fathers who immediately follow, show us; to say nothing of Scripture itself; referring to the creed as containing its outlines.† There can be no doubt, then, that each branch of the Church had its own distinct line of traditional teaching from the Apostles;—and that these branches were much, nay obstinately, attached to their respective traditions, and reluctant, on grounds of conscience, to yield them to each other, is proved by such differences in minor matters as occurred before the date of the council. For instance, the above-mentioned dispute between Ephesus and Rome arose from the circumstance, that the tradition of the former about the time of keeping Easter, derived from St. John, differed from that of the latter, derived from St. Peter and St. Paul. Again, sixty years later, the tradition of Rome concerning heretical baptism is represented as differing from that of Asia Minor. In both controversies each

* De Synod. 3—5.

† Iren. de Hæres. i. 10. Tertull. de Præscr. 15.

party religiously refused to yield to the other. The unanimity, then, in the Council of Nicæa was not a mutual sacrifice of differences for the sake of peace, it was not merely the decision of a majority, it was simply and plainly the joint testimony of the many branches of the Church, as independent witnesses, to the separate existence in each of them, from time immemorial, of that doctrine in which they found each other to agree.

Perhaps, however, it will be surmised, that this identity of the tradition in various places was the gradual growth of the intermediate period, during which the vague statements of the apostles, similar to those in Scripture, were made accurate and complete. This too is untenable. For, not to mention the existence of the Novatians, who had split off within 150 years of St. John's death, and yet held the Nicene doctrine as precisely as the Catholics, it so happens that in the very age of the apostles a sect arose external to the Church, which at once brought into dispute all those more subtle questions concerning the nature of Christ, which were agitated within the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries. We confidently affirm, that there is not an article in the Athanasian creed concerning the Incarnation, which is not anticipated in the controversy with the Gnostics. There is no question which the Apollinarian or the Nestorian heresy raised, which may not be decided in the words of Irenæus and Tertullian. We are not at this moment determining *which* side in the dispute was taken by the apostles and their immediate disciples,—we only say that the after questions *were* questions then; so that the Catholic doctrine, if not apostolic, is not a mere *addition* to apostolic statements, but a plain going counter to them, in one way or another,—whether, that is, the Apostles be supposed to have shut up these questions in the words of the creed, or to have explained them differently. Thus, on this supposition, we have to account for the phenomenon of this one and the same substitution every where of a new doctrine, in the course of 220 years, in times of persecution, in times of doctrinal controversies, among people of different languages, attachments, and religious attainments, and in spite of the safeguard of episcopal transmission; all this, moreover, altogether silently, without record of the change, or assignable reason why it should be made any where, on tenable reference to any external school or doctrine; lastly, with the unaccountable belief on the part of the fathers in the council, that their own view was that which the apostles had bequeathed them. Still further, it must be recollected, that they had in their different Churches the writings of Christian teachers during the intermediate time, much of which is lost now, but which made them judges, virtually infallible, of the doctrine of

the Church from the first. Hence too an additional argument results even at this day; for what remains of these writings serves the purpose of verifying the correctness of the tradition attested at Nicæa, just as we might inspect a money account, and, to satisfy ourselves, here and there cast up a sum, or make a calculation, in a balance sheet, which checks itself without such experiments. Alexandria, Carthage, Syria, Gaul, and Rome, thus bear independent witness, during the interval of 200 years, to the unanimous testimony extant at the end of it. And what adds incalculably to this testimony of the Ante-Nicene writers, is their stating the Catholic doctrine, not on the sole authority of their own respective Churches, though that were sufficient, but as the one doctrine even then preached and confessed all over Christendom.

This, then, is what is meant by Catholic tradition, and thus it attests the proper divinity of Christ, and anathematizes Socinianism and all other heresy on the subject; not by arguing and deducing from Scripture, as Dr. Hampden would say, but as being a separate apostolic information, parallel with Scripture, verified by, but not subsisting in it. We know from Scripture that there was a certain doctrine called "the doctrine of Christ," which was enforced by an anathema; we find it contemporaneously described in the primitive creed by the words the "Son of God;"—we find it tried, discussed, and sifted by the Gnostics, who arose even in apostolic times;—we find it committed to the keeping of the bishops of the Church as a perpetual legacy, and all along in connexion with the creed; at the end of 200 years after the last apostle's death, we find it publicly declared, still with reference to the creed, and attested by 300 bishops from various parts of the world, as that which had ever been preached and taught among them; lastly, we hear of no other doctrine on the subject, even professing to come from the apostles. Can we for an instance doubt, what shadow of pretence have we for doubting, that the doctrine so declared was that very truth which the apostles consigned to the Churches as saving? What cause of alarm have we, though it be proved by Chillingworth, or Mr. Blanco White, ever so convincingly, that Protestant communities, as such, have no right to impose articles of faith, or that uninspired men have no power to add to the metaphorical expressions found in Scripture? By this review of the case, we are as certain that the apostles had that definite view which we call orthodoxy, as we are that we ourselves have it; as certain that Arians or Socinians do not agree with the apostles, as that they do not agree with us; as much bound to apply to them the apostolic anathema, as we are sure that there were speculators to whom the apostles applied it.

And here it occurs to us to notice the obvious mistake of many writers who argue against *Catholic* tradition from the errors of the fathers, whatever they are, in recording, as *individuals*, matters of fact. Thus the notion entertained by Irenæus that our Saviour lived to be near fifty years old, Clement's assertion that St. Paul was married and the like, are urged as if a valid argument against doctrines built, not upon reports or rumours, but on the *agreement* of Christians in all times and places. Even Beausobre is not free from this mistake.

Perhaps the reader may consider enough has been said on this subject; yet, before dismissing it, he must be prevailed on to attend to one or two illustrations of it, which may press on him the *naturalness* of the argument.

First, we take a passage from the work which we have placed at the head of this article. The Clergyman objects to his Unitarian brother, that the mass of men as being unlearned cannot safely decide about the doctrine of the Trinity from reading Scripture, the original of which is in Greek. He is answered in the following words, which *mutatis mutandis* are but a statement of the argument from tradition, which we have been drawing out.

"I have never crossed the Atlantic, and cannot know, but by reading voyages and histories, or by oral communications, that any land exists there; voyagers and historians have often lied or erred; yet I am as much convinced of the existence of a continent there, as I am of the field now before my eyes. Do I then rely upon the testimony of men, who may be deceivers? No, it is not in the nature of things, it is absolutely impossible that such concurrence should take place in the relation of falsehoods. The history of the death and resurrection of Christ was written in a language as unknown to me as are opposite shores of the ocean I have never traversed; yet the concurrence of translators is as convincing to me as if the account were in my native language, and I do not rely on human authority."—p. 155.

Why would not this disputant consider the Fathers as *translators* of Scripture as regards Catholic doctrine? Again, let us refer to Paley's argument for the truth of the received Christian *history*, as contained in the seventh chapter of the first part of his *Evidences*. It will be found that what he there advances for the *facts* of the religion may be transferred, with little alteration, in proof of its *doctrines*. He begins by asking, "Whether the story which Christians have *now* be the story which Christians had then;" which has been our very question as regards the doctrines of our religion. He answers in the affirmative upon these four considerations:—First, because "there exists no trace or vestige of any other story." "There is not a document, or scrap of account, either contemporary with the commencement of Chris-

tianity, or extant within many ages after that commencement, which assigns a history substantially different from ours." Now this is clearly fulfilled as regards doctrine also. It is true there were some few who taught differently from the Catholic faith, but even they did so, not as witnessing an historical fact or from tradition, but as claiming to interpret Scripture for themselves; a ground of argument which does not interfere with the argument from tradition. Or, again, if they appealed to tradition, as the Gnostics did, it was to a secret tradition, known and delivered only by some few of the Apostles, and professedly contrary to their public teaching; a pretence which was evidently adopted to evade the difficulty of their opposition to Catholic tradition, and even grants, in the very form of it, that apostolical tradition was against them. The only real exception which we remember, is the small heretical party at Rome, in the beginning of the third century, which boldly pronounced their heresy to be apostolical; but even these soon abandoned their claim. Paley proceeds:—"the remote, brief and incidental notices of the affair, which are found in heathen writers, so far as they do go, go along with us." The same may be said of the doctrine also; Pliny witnesses to the worship of Christ as a God by His disciples, and Celsus objects it to them. Secondly, "the whole series of Christian writers, from the first age of the institution down to the present, in their discussions, apologies, arguments and controversies, proceed upon the general story which the Scriptures contain, and upon no other. This argument will appear to be of great force when it is known that we are able to trace back the series of writers to a contact with the historical books of the New Testament, and to the age of the first emissaries of the religion, and to deduce it, by an unbroken continuation, from that end of the train to the present." This surely applies word for word to the received doctrine also. He proceeds—"Now that the original story, the story delivered by the first preachers of the institution should have died away so entirely as to have left no record or memorial of its existence, although so many records and memorials of the time and transactions remain; and that another story should have stepped into its place and gained exclusive possession of the belief of all who professed themselves disciples of the institution, is beyond any example of the corruption of even oral tradition, and still less consistent with the experience of written history; and this improbability, which is very great, is rendered still greater by the reflection, that no such change as the oblivion of one story and the substitution of another, took place in any future period of the Christian era." Here Paley even adds a consideration which we had overlooked in the argument. "Thirdly, the religious rites and usages that prevailed amongst the early disciples

of Christianity, were such as belonged to and sprung out of the narrative now in our hands ; which accordancy shows, that it was the narrative upon which these persons acted, and which they had received from their teachers." The same holds good as regards the doctrines also ; Baptism witnesses to the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Eucharist grows out of the doctrines of the Incarnation and Atonement ; i. e. these rites arise from doctrines *such as* those which we at this day believe to have been Apostolic. Lastly, "the story was public at the time" the Gospels were written ; "the Christian community was already in possession of the substance and principal parts of the narrative. The Gospels were not the original cause of the Christian history being believed, but were themselves among the consequences of that belief." Paley says this to show that the story, coinciding though it did in its details with the Scripture narrative, yet rested on authority wider and other than it. The same may be said of Catholic doctrine also. While no one can deny that at least it is reconcilable with the sacred text, our opponents even contend that it was not the object of that text to enforce it, nor that it is built upon it. Paley concludes by maintaining that "these four circumstances are sufficient to support our assurance that the story which we have now is in general the story which Christians had at the beginning ;" meaning by *in general* "in its texture and in its principal facts ;" and we can desire nothing more to be granted to us as regards the received doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation.

Illustrations might be multiplied on this subject without end ; one more shall be added as afforded by the universal practice of baptising infants. "Since the proofs drawn by consequences from some places of Scripture, for any one side of this question," says Wall, in his preface to his well-known work on infant baptism, "are not so plain as to hinder the arguments drawn from other places for the other side from seeming considerable . . . it is no wonder that the readers of Scripture, at this distance from the Apostles' times, have fallen into contrary sentiments about the meaning of our Saviour's command, and the practice of the Apostles in reference to this baptizing of infants. When there is in Scripture a plain command to proselyte or make disciples all nations, baptizing them, but the method of doing it is not in all particulars expressly directed, it not being particularly mentioned whether they were to admit into this discipleship and baptism the infants of those that were converted . . . or whether they were to proceed in a new way, and baptize only the adult persons themselves, there is nobody that will doubt but that the Apostles knew what was to be done in this case ; and, consequently, that the Christian Churches in their time did as they should do in this matter. And since the Apostles lived, some of them, to near the end of the first century,

and St. John something beyond it, and had in their own time propagated the Christian faith and practice into so many countries, it can never sink into the head of any considering man, but that, such Christians as were ancient men about 100 or 150 years after that time of the Apostles' death, which is the year of Christ 200 or 250, must easily know whether infant baptism were in use at the time of the Apostles' death or not; because the fathers of some of them, and grandfathers of most of them, were born before that time, and were themselves infants in the Apostles' days, and so were baptized then in their infancy, if that were then the order, or their baptism deferred to adult age, if that were the use then," &c. Thus, it is plain, that those who deny the force of the argument from Catholic tradition in the case of the great gospel doctrines, go far to deprive us of the privilege of administering baptism to our children.

Our discussion has run to an exorbitant length; however, before parting with us, it may interest the reader to observe how the fathers are accustomed to speak of those *private* and *individual* judgments upon the high doctrines of Scripture, which Dr. Hampden benignantly styles "pious opinions," "guiltless differences," "theories of the Divine being and attributes," or, more harshly, as a "dogmatical and sententious wisdom," meaning thereby, if he can, to strike at sacred statements which are happily beyond the reach of scorner or disputant. "Perhaps some one may ask," says Vincent of Lerins, "whether the heretics also do not make use of testimonies from Holy Scripture? Yes, indeed, they do use them, and lay great stress on them, for you may see them ready quoters of each book of God's sacred Law, the books of Moses, of Kings, the Psalms, the Apostles, the Evangelists, the Prophets. Whether, indeed, they are among their own people, or among strangers, in private or in public, discoursing or writing, at convivial meetings or in the open ways, they *never at all advance any of their peculiar positions, without attempting to express it in Scripture language.* . . . If any one of the heretics be asked, how he proves that we ought to abandon the universal and ancient faith of the Church Catholic, he will promptly reply, 'It is written,' and on the spot is ready with a thousand texts and proofs, some from the Law, some from the Psalms, some from the Apostles, some from the Prophets, with the view of precipitating the unhappy soul, by a new and perverse interpretation of them, from the secure pinnacle of Catholicism into the gulf of heresy." And in like manner Tertullian, after repeating the Creed, which he calls the rule or system of faith, and to which it is the Christian's duty to adhere, proceeds to caution us against mere arguing or deducing from Scripture, whether for ourselves or in controversy. "Thy faith," he says, "hath made thee whole,"

not a troubling of the Scriptures. Faith rests in the rule [i. e. the Creed]. You have the Law,—and salvation in the keeping of it. But this cross-examining of Scripture springs from restlessness; having its only glory in the display of skill. Let restlessness yield to faith; glory among men to salvation of the soul . . . As for that person, if there be such, for whose sake you descend to a comparison of Scriptures, to confirm him when in doubt, will he in consequence incline to truth, or rather to heresies? Influenced by the very fact, that he sees you have hitherto gained no ground, and stand even with your adversary in denying this point and defending that, he will undoubtedly leave this level contest in still greater uncertainty, not knowing which side he is to judge to be heresy. For surely nothing can hinder them retorting upon us, if they are minded, the charges we bring against them. Nay, they must, in self-defence, maintain that we rather introduce corruptions of Scripture and false expositions, in order to support their own pretences to the truth. Therefore I do not advise appeal to the Scriptures: it is a ground on which there can be either no victory, or a doubtful one, or one as good as doubtful.”—[*Vincent. Comm.* 35; *Tertull. de Præscript.* 14—19.] It would seem, then, that Tertullian and Vincent had not much greater respect for mere deductions from Scripture than Dr. Hampden; differing from him, however, in this,—first, that they called such private interpretations, when Catholic tradition was neglected, not “pious” but “impious opinions;” next, that they did not impute them to the Church Catholic, whose doctrine, though verified by Scripture, is not literally and actually deduced from it. What they would have called Dr. Hampden’s own opinions, whether viewed in themselves, or in the mode in which he professes to arrive at them, it does not belong to this place or time to determine.

ART. IX.—1. *Proposals for the creation of a Fund to be applied to the Building and Endowment of Additional Churches in the Metropolis.* By Charles James Lord Bishop of London. London: Fellowes. Rivingtons. Hatchard.

2. *The People of God called upon to build the House of Prayer; a Sermon preached at St. Peter’s, Colchester, Essex.* By the Rev. James S. M. Anderson, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. London: Rivingtons.

3. *The Spiritual Claims of the Metropolis, a Sermon.* By the Rev. Baptist Wriotheshy Noel. London: Low.

4. *A Sermon in behalf of the Bishop of London’s Proposals.* By the Rev. W. Dodsworth. London: Burns.

THE Church of England lies under a fresh debt of gratitude to the Bishop of London for this seasonable and vigorous appeal.

Powerful in its language, and startling in its facts, it has kindled a flame, which, we trust, instead of being extinguished, will burn brightly, and spread wide. Other men have done their duty: nor have our humble efforts been wanting to the cause. But the Bishop's publication, from the precision of its aim, as well as from the authority of the writer, is by far the most effective which the awful subject has called forth. His lordship has put himself at the head of the religious movement, which had for some time been perceptible; and has done what no other person could have done half so well; in fact, what no other person was qualified to do at all. Nor has he merely thrown his own weight into the scale; but, by the announcement of his plan, he has given a definite channel, and a palpable object, in which, and towards which, the exertions of others may be most advantageously directed. If, after what has been accomplished in Cheshire, in Gloucestershire, and in other counties of England,—at Edinburgh, at Glasgow, and in other towns of Scotland,—London cannot actually take the lead, now, at least, let the metropolis set an example to the empire. And the scheme of building fifty new churches at once by voluntary subscription, is a noble project, worthy of the first city in the world. Yet, glorious and generous as this subscription is, and much as we rejoice at the Christian liberality of our countrymen and fellow-citizens, let it be kept in remembrance that the Church does not abandon its claim upon the state. For ourselves, we should be glad, even now, if legal provision could be added to voluntary contribution; or if the imperial parliament could be induced to double the money which may be collected from individuals. Hence we have remarked with pleasure the Bishop's concluding suggestion as to a duty on coals; for it is always well to assert a principle, although the attempt to enforce it may be hopeless from the distemper of the times:—just as it is well to demand a debt, which is not likely to be paid, lest the claim should hereafter be called obsolete, and met with a statute of limitations.

The want of new churches in many spots is appalling. The awful *amount* of spiritual destitution in London, and other large towns, may be learnt from the official accounts furnished by the Bishop, and from many other statistical documents, which have been made public again and again. We will not weaken the impression by giving only a portion, where we cannot find room for the whole. Suffice it to say, that there is hardly church-room for one tenth of the population, where there ought, at least, to be church-room for one third. The tremendous evils which must be engendered by this state of things—in all the hideous and abominable shapes of ungodliness, profligacy, intemperance, improvidence, turbulence, filth, riot, sullenness, ferocity, desperation,

disease; the unmitigated and intolerable penury which is ever at the heels of vice and low debauchery; the destruction of physical, and mental, and moral, and spiritual health; the murder of soul and body; the atmosphere of pollution spreading and propagating itself without a check;—these frightful evils may, perhaps, be imagined by every man with more force than they can be described, even by the able delineations of Mr. Anderson, Mr. Noel, and Mr. Dodsworth.

A larger supply, then, of churches, and clergymen attached to them, in connection with the Establishment, is emphatically *the* want of our country, and, most of all, of our towns. Without putting our trust, more than Dr. Chalmers, in any magic of masonry, we may yet say, that the very architecture—the building standing visibly before the eyes of men—must produce its solemn effect. The edifice of public worship, as it raises its sacred head, has its eloquence and its power. There is a moral attraction in its walls. It speaks of the hallowed purposes for which it is reared. It is itself a call to holiness, which will not quite be disregarded. It shines forth a beacon and a monument both of philanthropy and of prayer.

But the church will have its living ministers. And they are as the salt, which will season, in God's good time, the mass around them, and prevent the progress of corruption. The church becomes a nucleus, around which all other pious, and charitable, and provident institutions, are most readily and most beneficially formed; and, although such institutions may be started without parochial clergymen, they will seldom be *worked*; although they may be announced with a magnificent conception, they may be almost still-born, or languish and perish in their cradle, unless there are parochial clergymen, who will take the chief trouble of nursing and fostering them. Let us look, too, at the operation of the scheme, with reference to the different classes of which the community is composed. First, then, as to the *poor*. Let it be borne in mind, that, wherever there is very little church-room, the poor will usually have *none*. The pews will be gradually rented by the richer inhabitants of a district to the exclusion of the less affluent; and the gayer and smarter people will, by degrees, drive even out of the free seats those who are more humbly clad:—not that the latter will be arrogantly dispossessed; but that they will shrink from sitting beside persons who outshine them, and will yield the places from a feeling of modest diffidence or of false shame:—so either absenting themselves altogether from public worship, or going to meeting-houses, where they can be more at ease. Wherefore, if the poor are objects of Christian solicitude to us, the supply of more adequate accommodation for all classes,

so that none may be betrayed—alas! we had almost said forced—either into irreligion or into dissent—this, we repeat, is the very thing which we need.

But, in a somewhat different point of view, the plan of fresh churches and fresh ministers is necessary for another rank in the community even more than for the very poor. There are many ties—long may they continue—between the Church and the aristocracy. There are many ties—long may they continue—between the Church and the poor. The Church has a firm hold upon the highest and upon the lowest of the land:—upon the former, through its dignity—upon the latter, through its charity. The clergy are allied to the gentry—and, in many cases, to the nobility—by family connection, and by the habits either of official or domestic intercourse: they are endeared oftentimes to the multitude by the offices of benevolence, and as the dispensers of temporal, no less than spiritual good. Their influence, unhappily, is least, just with that class of persons who are now become, through the process of our legislation, almost omnipotent in the empire. Among the retail tradesmen, the 30*l.* or 20*l.* or 10*l.* householders, they appear neither as friends and equals, nor yet as patrons and benefactors. Where they are brought into contact with them—as at vestry meetings or parish elections—they are too frequently brought into collision. They have little share—while in each of the other ranks of life they have much—in the education of their children. *Here* they can scarcely be said to exercise a presiding guardianship over either the present or the rising generation. The citizens of this grade are estranged from the Church, partly by temporary circumstances, which soon, we trust, will pass away,—partly by their relative position in the social scale, and by the feelings of a proud and sturdy independence which is conscious of power, and yet, in a certain sense, conscious of inferiority; which can neither aspire to be quite on the same level with the clergyman, nor consent to be much beneath it; which can neither court his personal acquaintance, nor require his pecuniary assistance; which neither seeks to entertain him as a guest, nor wishes to receive, in another capacity, either himself, or the visitor appointed by him, who comes round to distribute tracts, or to receive small deposits. They seem placed, as it were, either above or below many of the parochial ministrations of the established pastor. On the other hand, the enemies of the Church—we are, of course, speaking generally, without taking the numerous exceptions into account—find an open door, and a cordial welcome. The dissenting minister sits at the board, and expounds at the tea-table: the revolutionary newspaper, or the semi-infidel magazine, has a ready access to the hearth. Moreover, men of this

class, with that fondness for power, which cleaves in every situation to the human bosom, are apt to prefer clergymen whom they have nominated or chosen themselves; hence their bias is usually towards a seceding parson, who is dependent upon their aid; or, within the pale of the Establishment, their favourite is the orator at a proprietary chapel, or the lecturer who has preached them a probationary sermon, and gone round to solicit their suffrages. In fact, they have an affection, very easily understood, for any voluntary system, in which a good deal of canvassing for votes and influence is of necessity and perpetually involved.

And here, let it be observed, the obstacle to more friendly intercourse lies not on the part of the clergyman, but on the part of the citizen such as we have described. Practically, therefore, it is no sufficient answer to say that the minister of the Gospel, the ordained pastor of the parish or district, ought to have *no* social position; that he belongs to all ranks, and ought to have the same relation to all ranks. Clergymen are citizens too: they have their civic place, as well as their ecclesiastical and spiritual character: and, if we would grapple with difficulties to any useful purpose, we must look to human nature and human society as they exist in their actual constitution.

How, then, is this barrier to social improvement—for it is in reality a very formidable barrier—to be removed? Much may be done by subdividing overgrown parishes into manageable districts, where the appointed minister may at length create opportunities of knowing all, and making himself known to all. Much also may be done—as much has been done—by a kind and conciliatory, yet not lax and unspiritual disposition, in clergymen endeavouring to recommend themselves to the lower, as well as the higher department of the middle order in the community; yet careful, at the same time, not to alienate the one class in their attempts to propitiate another. Our present course of observations, however, leads us rather to say, that the class of ministers who will belong to the contemplated churches, together with the peculiar tenure of their appointments, repudiating popular election, yet in a great measure dependent upon public opinion, may be more serviceable than any other could be in gaining over this portion of the community to the Church.

At the same time, we must think also of the rich. Wherefore we would humbly venture to suggest one or two cautions as to the present bias of our ecclesiastical economy; because the perfection of an establishment must be its adaptation to *all* ranks and classes in a kingdom. That three thousand souls are as many as an individual minister can include in his sole spiritual charge,

while his regard is also upon their temporal interests, is an allegation which we have no thought of attempting to controvert. But it is one proposition to say that no single minister can undertake the entire pastoral care of a population which extends beyond three thousand persons, and quite another to assert that the whole land ought to be parcelled out into *separate* districts containing three thousand persons each. In many cases it may be advisable, on many accounts, that one clergyman should retain a general superintendence over six thousand, or twelve thousand, or even a larger number; keeping two or more curates in constant employment, and making an *internal sub-division* of his parish, according to the discretion which he exercises under his diocesan. Complete equalization, either of duty, or emolument, or authority, has been, and will, we trust, continue to be, an element quite unknown to our English scheme of ecclesiastical polity. We may take many lessons from the Scottish Establishment: but there are some parts of its economy which we must never imitate: there are some clerical views entertained in Scotland which we never wish to cross the Tweed: and we must observe the differences as well as the agreements. Presbyterianism and Episcopacy cannot be made to rest on the same basis. The Church of Scotland is essentially a system of equality: the Church of England is essentially a system of gradations. Bishops, archdeacons, deans, prebendaries, rectors, or other incumbents of parishes, ministers of districts, and curates, while they all conduce to the symmetry of the fabric, and the solemn uses for which it was ordained, are all necessary, and all necessary alike, if we would reach all the various classes of society—if we would adapt our Church to their several wants and expectations—if we would have our clergy, and the spirit which the presence of the clergy introduces, interfused among them all. It is often said, that Episcopacy suits England, and Presbyterianism suits Scotland. And the objection urged, respectively, against either system, may be, that Episcopacy hardly penetrates the middle, or rather—if we may use the term—the *penultimate* class of a community; and that Presbyterianism hardly mounts to its summit: whence it happens that the shop-keepers in England are so often Dissenters, and that, in Scotland, so enormous a proportion of the highest ranks are Episcopaliaus. But this disadvantage is, on our side, we believe, an accidental and transient, rather than a constant and necessary result; and we cannot but think—to put the matter for the occasion not upon Scriptural but economical grounds—that a well-organized Episcopacy is far more capable of indefinite expansion and adaptation than a well-organized Presbyterianism,

mainly from the gradations which it fosters within itself. Even in listening to Dr. Chalmers, let us not abandon our old and wise, and most salutary reverence for our English Episcopal Church.

The Bishop of London's plan, we may be sure, will be to complete, rather than disturb that system of general and parochial arrangements, which may be said to be coeval and coextensive with the Establishment. And we should apologize for this apparent digression, but that we know a disposition to be entertained in other quarters quite to remodel the parochial system; and, having first laid hands upon the ecclesiastical revenues, to re-distribute them among a certain number of bishops, and an array of district ministers, having each about three thousand souls under their care; the intermediate orders of our clergy being altogether, or very nearly extinguished.

But we return to the subject more immediately before us. Details and all minuter inquiries we shall defer, until the Bishop's complete recovery from his lamented illness shall enable him to put forth his specific proposals. We shall not here drop a word upon the question of patronage; which may, perhaps, create some little difficulty and embarrassment hereafter:—we will only look at the bright side of the picture, and admire its brightness: we entertain a confident hope that the subscription will be very large: we rejoice to see all parties contributing gloriously to this good work, to behold only the sacred emulation of Christian generosity: and we trust that the result will show how vast a proportion of the property and the piety of the land is ranged on the side of the Establishment.

So far, we shall have carried all our readers along with us: and we have rather to apologize for going over the beaten ground of obvious truisms, than to expect the slightest opposition from any friends of the Church. But we must now proceed for a moment to other considerations, as to which many men, entirely zealous and conscientious, although, in our opinion, misjudging—many men whose intentions we altogether respect, and whose motives we must almost venerate—will differ with us both in their theory, and by their practice. Now, we hail the Bishop of London's project, not only for the sake of the good which it must do, but also on account of other plans, on which it may help to put an extinguisher. Some may be startled at this declaration: his lordship himself, we apprehend, will hardly thank us; not, perhaps, having contemplated the effects, which we trust, nevertheless, to see ensue. But a constraining sense of duty urges us to say, that we believe, and are happy to believe, that the erection and endowment of new churches, with clergymen affixed to the districts in

which they are built, will arrest, and ultimately supersede the system of home missions, and general visiting societies, and pastoral aid societies, and a hundred other mushroom associations, which would establish quite new centres of influence and authority within the Church of England, and disjoint the frame of its discipline, and thoroughly disturb its local and parochial organization.

The indulgence, however, of an angry tone of controversy, would be here as completely out of place, as, we trust, it is at variance with our own tempers. The work of Christianization must be done. The only question is, *how* is it to be done? We say, as far as human means are concerned, by the maintenance of Episcopal government and parochial ministrations; without the intervention of societies having lay-presidents, lay vice-presidents, lay-treasurers, and committees composed partly of laymen; which either, if they fail, must distract attention from better plans, while they undertake a work which they cannot accomplish,—or, if they succeed, and gather strength, must attain a power, *in direct proportion to their success*, which is sure, in the end, to clash, perilously and violently, with the constituted discipline and the regular action of the Church. We would not disparage the potent, and, in many cases, the wonder-working principle of combination. Yet new associations are dangerous elements, when acting upon a Church, which is itself an association of another kind. The only available plea for more than half these societies is the plea of urgent necessity. But the validity of this plea the erection and endowment of new churches will do away. True it is, as some have in substance objected, that churches are not visitors; that churches are not household ministrations; that churches are not schools, or saving-banks, or lending-libraries, or other parochial institutions, or the living beings by whom those institutions are to be managed. No: but churches will have faithful ministers attached to them; and faithful ministers will bring all these things in their train. Plant but a church, and all the loveliest flowers of Christianity will grow around it. Erect but a house of prayer, and other institutions will arise and shine with their attendant lustre, like satellites about a luminary of the noblest magnitude. Station but a minister, and he will become a guarantee for the rest. He will, almost always, find local visitors, if he needs pastoral aid. Or, if there be a deficiency in some places, and an overplus in others, why may not persons place themselves *generally*, as visitors, at the disposal of the bishop of a diocese, or the incumbent of a large parish, without the intervention of societies; more especially if it be meant, after all, to refer to the bishop, and ask leave of

the incumbent? Our chief trust, however, is in the extension and perfection of the parochial system. Even as it is, overtasked, overburdened, almost overwhelmed as many clergymen now are, how vast is the good achieved; and all the other instrumentality which is at work for the moral improvement of the country, what is it in comparison with the ministrations of the working clergy—or, rather, where would it be without them? Yet we ought also to recollect, that too large a sphere of duty may be a fearful temptation to a clergyman. He feels that he cannot fairly be blamed, if weeds are spreading over a district far too wide for his spiritual culture; and, therefore, he may be enticed into sloth, while secure from reprehension. Or he may see that he cannot hope to overtake his work; and so one stimulus to exertion may die within him. He may do almost nothing, because there is too much to be done. He may shrink from the fatigue of visiting from house to house, when so many, after all, must be left unvisited. He may throw up the work in despair; and the sense of responsibility may be weakened from the felt impossibility of satisfying all its obligations. But how, on the other hand, would the aspect of things be improved, how delightful the prospect and how great the ingathering, if, in the vineyard of the Lord, there were more labourers, and more division of labour!

Then why, it may be asked, reject pastoral aid from Lord Ashley, and Sir Oswald Mosely, and Sir Andrew Agnew, and Mr. Labouchere? Why seek to establish an antagonism between the two schemes? why may they not proceed together and side by side, becoming adjuncts, and auxiliaries, and supplements each to each? Our answer is, for we always leave sorer topics until we are compelled to introduce them—because human means are finite: because there is but a certain quantity of energy and money to be bestowed even upon the promotion of the cause of God and his Gospel. Therefore the two projects for building churches under the Bishop of London or authorized trustees, and of making provision for the spiritual wants of the people by City Missions and Pastoral Aid Societies, must in some measure interfere. Hence comes the vast importance of the inquiry, which plan is the best and safest? We say, with unhesitating confidence, give all possible extent and efficiency to the plan of building and endowing new churches and chapels. Throw *all* the resources into the one channel; do not divert any part of it into the other. You have a certain sum of which you would dispose in religious charity: you are inclined to bestow half upon the erection of churches, and half upon the Pastoral Aid Society, or some similar association; we say, do not divide it; subscribe

the whole to the erection of churches. Do not distract your attention, do not dissipate and fritter away your funds, by withdrawing a portion from an unmixed and unquestionable good to the advancement, we will not allege, of a rival, but of a different, scheme, which is at least open to very manifest objections. Build upon the old foundations, which are known to be sound, rather than upon the new, which may at last prove rotten. Do not invert the order of things. Do not have recourse to strange and hazardous expedients, ill adapted to our clerical polity, and out of character with the rest of our ecclesiastical Establishment, before you have tried to the utmost the simpler and the more obvious. The one is a plan which leans upon the unshaken buttresses of former time, and has in its favour the unvarying testimony of many ages, and is in unison with the history, and the constitution, and the practice of the Church; the other is a fresh and uncongenial experiment, which has no certain or calculable futurity more than it has any connection with the past; which *may* introduce strifes and irregularities and disorders; which *may* eventually dislocate and unhinge the entire frame-work of episcopal jurisdiction and parochial management. We do honestly confess that we should rejoice to see some of these multiform societies broken up; their exchequers emptied of their contents, and those contents flung into the treasury of the church-building and church-endowing parties:—in a word, fairly turned over to the bishop's account. To sound the cry of "*more churches and more clergymen*" in the ear of the parliament and of the nation, is to bring a blessing upon the land. To do aught else *may* be to see the distemper, but to mistake the remedy. This is the one safe, legitimate, effectual, consistent mode of removing a dreadful mischief which is quite acknowledged on all hands. It is addition, not subversion;—extension, not change. For we do not require any new-fangled machinery. We want engines of the old description; but in greater number, and of larger power. We must put on more steam.

Let it be our first, our undivided care, to complete that parochial system, from which, under Providence, so many blessings have flowed, and with which so many hallowing and hallowed associations are bound up. Let us see the various ranks of a vicinity linked together by the august solemnities of an united devotion; and summoned, as it were, to all their respective and all their common duties by the same sound of the church-bell.

ART. X.—*The History of the Christian Church, from the Ascension of Jesus Christ to the Conversion of Constantine.*
By the Rev. Edward Burton, D.D. 1836.

THE unexpected and immature death of the highly accomplished writer of this volume, is one of those events which have tended of late years to change the tone of opinion prevailing in the University to which he belonged, and to introduce into it for good and for evil the characteristics of a new generation. Dr. Burton is the third in succession of Divinity Professors, who have been cut off in the beginning, or in the fulness of their labours and usefulness; men of great consideration in the place, who, doubtless, were they now alive, would take a principal part in the direction of the University in the stormy times seemingly before it. Few men of late years have had the extended influence of Dr. Hodson, or the popularity with junior men of Dr. Lloyd, Bishop of Oxford, both of whom were removed at a time when the Church itself, if not the scene of their previous reputation, seemed likely to feel the impression of their minds. In like manner, the death of Dr. Elmsley took place when he had just entered upon duties to which the careful and silent studies of years had recommended him, and was about to devote to the service of the University the habits of precise thought, the composure of mind, gentleness of bearing, and gifts and attainments of a more striking character, which were discernible by all who knew him ever so little. Professors Mills and Nicoll, are additional instances, in late years, of rising abilities and erudition, cut short in their career by an (humanly speaking) untimely stroke. Such successive losses may, for what we know, be common at all times; but, whether common or not, they cannot happen without changing the character of a place, if there be room for change. And such seems to have been the effect of them in the University in which they have occurred; almost all the distinguished men enumerated were more or less specimens of a school which seems for many years to have had prevalence, or rather supreme sway in the place, so as even to constitute the existing academical body itself. Since quiet days have succeeded in Oxford, to political feuds and parties, from the latter part of the last century almost down to the recent passing of the Emancipation Bills, elegant scholarship and literature have been the main road to distinction, and an abstinence from subjects purely ecclesiastical, or even an indisposition towards them, the characteristic, or at least the accidental property of the gentleman and divine. Some of the most eminent members of the Episcopal Bench at this moment, are instances of the

truth of this remark, at the time they were promoted ; and what they were in younger days, such were the individuals above-mentioned. They were learned in the languages, they were men of classical attainments, of various accomplishments ; they were loved and revered in private ; but they either were in no sense theologians, or they added theology to their other attainments, with little concern to ground themselves in it as a science. There was in their day little of political or religious commotion to draw away their minds from criticism and literature, or to make theology much more than a theoretical or amateur pursuit. The Socinian and Predestinarian controversies, and the external evidences, almost exhausted the range of divinity ; and though the sagacity of Bishop Lloyd discerned the renewal of hostilities with the Romanists in prospect, and began, in this very Review,* to prepare for defence, he was not allowed time to do much more than direct attention to a conflict of which he himself was to be spared the toil.

If there was any one who might be deemed an exception to these remarks, it was the lamented divine who has led to them. He was unquestionably, not only variously read in classical and modern literature, but deeply versed in the writings of the fathers. Always excepting one venerated individual, whose name will at once suggest itself to Oxford men, he had above all men reputation for patristical learning, a reputation which belonged rather to the seventeenth century than to our own. Yet it may be doubted whether even he was not better acquainted with the writings of Christian antiquity, as historical records, or depositaries of facts, or again in their bearing upon one or two important modern questions, than in themselves, in their great fundamental principles, and their peculiar character and spirit, or what is sometimes called their *ἦθος*. There was nothing in the circumstances of the day to send him to their works as a revelation of times, feelings and principles gone by ; and his study in consequence was far from embracing even an abstract knowledge of their views. While, then, his reading spoke forcibly for the loyalty and devotion of his heart towards those prophets of the ancient truth, and tended much to encourage younger men in the study of them, yet it scarcely separated him in mental characteristics from that classical school to which we have above referred him.

But Dr. Burton's death is remarkable in another point of view. He was not only an University man ; he was an active parish priest, and emphatically a religious man. We mean a man who had the heart and the opportunity to evidence sincere and practical

* *Vide British Critic for 1825.*

religious views; and consequently, abstract and inoperative as might be his theological reading, he was necessarily forced by his very seriousness and earnestness into the adoption of a definite line of action, at least during the recent critical position of the University. He might not perhaps make his ecclesiastical learning bear upon his conduct; but a determinate line and a decided conduct he could not forbear adopting; he was too religious to forbear it, and the form of religious opinion which he chose was that which according to all appearances is likely to prevail in the high places of the Church, unless, which is not improbable, some violent convulsion throw all its interests into disorder. As the school of Waterland succeeded to that of Bull, in consequence of the exigencies of the times, which brought into notice men of a more *Protestant* complexion, (if we may be allowed a catechresis in the use of the word); so, according to all appearance, if things go smooth, we shall find a still more modern divinity necessary to harmonize with those secondary systems in religion and education to which the policy of the day is tending. The probability is that the influential places in the Church will be held by men of a widely different stamp from those who have hitherto gone by the designation of high Churchmen. That clear and inflexible adherence to rule and precedent, which is called by its enemies stiffness and narrowness of mind, but which saved the Church during the last century from the gulf of Ultra-Protestantism, is melting away under the influence of feelings which might rightly be called charitable, did they answer in the long run. We are likely to have men in station and authority, not openly latitudinarian, but accessible to all sorts of impressions from without, and deficiently acquainted with the peculiarities and excellences of the system they administer. Unexceptionable in doctrine themselves, except as being tinged with the popular religion of the day, they will give their confidence and their preferment to men inferior to themselves, and as these parties in turn will bestow their own patronage on persons who come short proportionably of themselves, there is danger of the Church being overrun with objectionable principles, while the first authors of it are amiable, and on the whole orthodox men. When we class the late Professor among these, it is not as forgetting the noble stand he made for Christian truth in 1834, when, at the head of the tutorial body, he drew up that distinct and impressive avowal of the dependance of education on religion, which was ultimately subscribed by two thousand members of convocation. Such a man, if indulgent, would certainly be so within limits, beyond which he would be inflexible; still his humility and unaffected simplicity of mind were such, he was so unsuspecting of others,

so liberal and expansive in his feelings, so much better endowed with candour and generosity than with a clear apprehension of our ecclesiastical position, that it is easy to see where on the whole he would have taken his stand, had he been raised to those higher preferments which were all but his when he died. His loss is the greatest, perhaps, which his principles could have sustained in Oxford. We think it no disparagement to the talents and virtues of those who remain as upholders of them, to say that it is irreparable. His equal or his second cannot be found in the combined qualifications of extensive reading, unwearied diligence, promptness and despatch, parochial activity, kindliness of heart, and general popularity. No man so considerable ever bore his faculties more meekly. No man descended more entirely to the level of those with whom he conversed, submitted to their waywardness, or sympathized with their peculiarities. No man thought less of self, laboured less for the appearance of consistency, or feared less the confession of doubt or error. No man less excited in others those feelings which tend to jealousy, distance, and disunion. In his death, what may be called the moderate section of the University, have lost perhaps the only man who was qualified to head and lead them, or to serve as a restraint on persons of keener or more eccentric minds. The consequences of it have been seen sooner than might have been anticipated; his party have in effect vanished with him, and those who maintained more and maintained less have come into collision.

If it were not for the hazard of intruding upon subjects beyond human sagacity, something might be said in connexion with the above remarks, on the indications which the existing events furnish of an approaching conflict, sooner or later, between what are commonly considered extreme opinions. As decks are cleared before a fight, so in the field of ecclesiastical politics, those who were hitherto middle men, are either taken out of the way, or retreat to this or that side in the struggle. The crisis may be delayed an indefinite time by external events; a foreign war might call off all our thoughts in another direction; or the return of the Conservatives to power might partially suspend the natural operation of the principles at work, and compose the surface of the Church into an apparent calm. Still, whether by a secret underground influence, or by outward manifestation, what are called extreme opinions will spread on either side, and sooner or later will join issue, and find a solution. The highly to be revered school of divinity, commonly called high Church, has lately been bereaved of its brightest ornament, in the admirable Prelate who filled the See of Durham; while it is fast losing ground in the Christian Knowledge Society. As to the party

who seem to be succeeding to their power, and are full of hope and triumph in consequence, they have no internal consistency, clearness of principle, strength of mind, or weight of ability sufficient to keep the place they may perhaps win. They have the seeds of dissolution in them, and are already breaking into pieces. As Whigs and Tories have disappeared from the stage of politics, so the high Church section of the Establishment, to which we owe so great a debt in years past, is almost broken up, and the Low party has a mortal disease upon it.

It has been thought best to make the above remarks on the present condition and prospects of the Church, in frank, perhaps in blunt language—but it must not be thence supposed that we view the state of things lightly, or range ourselves on neither side of the contest; but we wish to draw our readers' attention simply to our ecclesiastical condition itself, as the first step in their setting about to form a judgment upon it.

The work before us, published under the direction of the Literature Committee attached to the Christian Knowledge Society, is such as might have been anticipated from its lamented author. It presents a luminous and distinct account of the fortunes of the Church during its three first centuries, condensed into a small volume without effort, and abounding in learning without display. It is the composition of one who has full mastery over his materials, and (as it were) got his subject by heart; and it will doubtless be of the greatest value to those who are already interested in church history, and either desire further information, or a synoptical view of what is familiar to them. These we consider to be its chief merits; its deficiency on the other hand, if it must be noticed, lies in a want of unity in the history, in the absence of plan or scope, the neglect to interpret the events and facts which occur. This indeed is a very tolerable fault, especially in this age, when scarcely a man can prevail on himself to write without some preconceived theory in his mind, or some striking but peculiar view, which he takes care to herald forth at every pause in the narrative, and to use for the perversion rather than elucidation of its details. As times go, it is a relief and a refreshment to read a work, which is not straining after novelties, and torturing men and things on the Procrustean bed of what the author perhaps calls a "simple principle." As it is pleasant to sit by a smooth river, and gaze upon its stream equably flowing by, so is Dr. Burton's work a balm and solace to those who have busied themselves in many thoughts, and are weary of controversy and speculation. But this very quality which recommends it to the harassed student, is somewhat a disadvantage to it, considered as intended for popular use. It is better indeed to be

sound and accurate, than merely amusing; we do not wish history to be made either a romance or a diatribe, to be poeticized or philosophized: still to interest and to instruct are main objects in its composition, and here we consider Dr. Burton's work, with all its excellence, to be somewhat defective. There is too little of moral and of lesson, we do not mean deduced, but deducible from the course of affairs as he presents them. Yet even in this respect his work is a very considerable advance upon Mosheim's history; which is as dry and sapless as if the Church were some fossil remains of an antediluvian era, lifeless itself and without any practical bearing on ourselves. Nay it is in this respect an advance even on the writings of the present very learned Bishop of Lincoln, who has apparently been led by an accurate taste, critical exactness, and dislike of theory or paradox, into an over-estimation of facts, as such, separated from their meaning and consequences. Dr. Burton had much of this critical accuracy also; yet we should rather attribute this same peculiarity, as far as it is found in this and other of his works, to the cause above indicated, viz. to his having apparently taken up theology without such an accurate grounding in its principles as would enable him to speak confidently as a moralist or divine.

Dr. Burton commences his history from the day of Pentecost, which he conceives to be a truer date for the foundation of the Christian Church, than that of our Lord's public ministry. The transactions of the first century occupy not very far from half the volume, and consist principally of the details of the apostles' own labours. The usual subjects follow; the martyrdom of Ignatius, the spread of Gnosticism, the Paschal controversy, the Persecutions, Montanus, Theodotus and Praxeas, in the second century; and in the third, Tertullian and Origen, the Platonists, Cyprian and the Rebaptizers, Novatus and Novatian, Dionysius of Alexandria, Manicheism, and the gradual victories of the Gospel over the powers of the world. The history ends with the conversion of Constantine. It will be the most respectful course to our author now to put before the reader some passages from his work, with such brief observations of our own as they may suggest. Dr. Burton thus manfully states his view of the tone to be adopted by the ecclesiastical historian.

"I wish, however, distinctly to state, that there are some points upon which the ecclesiastical historian may be allowed to have made up his mind, without being charged with partiality. Thus, he is not required to speak of Christianity as if it was merely one of the numerous forms of religion which had appeared in the world. He is to write as a Christian, addressing himself to Christians; and as he is not called upon to prove

Christianity to be true, so he may assume that his readers are acquainted with its doctrines. In speaking, therefore, of the first propagation of the Gospel, I have said little concerning the nature of those new opinions which were then, for the first time, delivered to the world. A contemporary heathen historian would have thought it necessary to describe them; they would have formed an important feature in the history of the times; but a Christian historian does not feel called upon to explain *the principles of the doctrine of Christ*. He supposes his readers not only to know these principles, but to believe them; and though the differences among Christians form a necessary part of the History of the Church, it is sufficient to say of Christianity itself, as first preached by the apostles, that it is the religion contained in the Bible."—pp. 15, 16.

And he thus forcibly describes that peculiarity in Christianity, which brought upon it persecution from the heathen.

"The Greeks and the Romans had long been acquainted with the Jews; but they looked upon their religion as a foolish superstition, and treated their peculiar customs with contempt. This treatment might be provoking to individual Jews, but it generally ensured for them toleration as a people; and hence they were seldom prevented from establishing a residence in any town within the Roman empire. The Jews repaid this indulgence by taking little pains to make proselytes. In their hearts they felt as much contempt for the superstitions of the heathen, as the latter professed openly for the Jews; but they were content to be allowed to follow their own occupations, and to worship the God of their fathers without molestation. The Christians might have enjoyed the same liberty, if their principles had allowed it; and for some time the heathen could not, or would not, consider them as anything else than a sect of the Jews. But a Christian could not be sincere without wishing to make proselytes. He could not see religious worship paid to a false God, without trying to convince the worshipper that he was following a delusion. *The Divine Founder of Christianity did not intend it to be tolerated; but to triumph*. It was to be the universal, the only religion; and though the apostles, like the rest of their countrymen, could have borne with personal insults and contempt, they had but one object in view, and that was to plant the cross of Christ upon the ruins of every other religion.

"This could not fail, sooner or later, to expose the preachers of the Gospel to persecution; for every person who was interested in keeping up the old religions, would look upon the Christians as his personal enemies."—pp. 83, 84.

In this extract we see the same high religious principle avowed by the author, which led to his strenuous effort in favour of dogmatic religion in 1834. In the document then drawn up by him, he carried out the protest, borne in the above passage in favour of Christianity in the general, to a maintenance of the creed of

orthodoxy in particular. The words to which we allude are as follows:—

“ They [the Declarationists] wish to state in the first place, that the University of Oxford has always considered religion to be the foundation of all education; and they cannot themselves be parties to any system of instruction, which does not rest upon this foundation. They also protest against the notion, that religion can be taught on the vague and comprehensive principle of admitting persons of every creed. When they speak of religion, they mean the doctrines of the Gospel, as revealed in the Bible, and as maintained by the Church of Christ in its best and purest times,” &c.

It has been much the fashion at various times, to speak as if Christianity was becoming better and better understood as time went on, and its professors more enlightened and more virtuous. In saying this, we do not allude to the creed of Montanus, Manichee or Mahomet, or of the Gnostics, each of whom professed to be bringing to perfection that system which the apostles began indeed, but only rudely understood; nor again of the St. Simonians; nor of those religionists of the sixteenth century and their descendants now, who teach that the visible Church was lost in error for an indefinite period, and then emerged into purity and light such as Irenæus himself did not enjoy;* but of men of the present day, who are considered especially men of the world, well-judging and practical men, and who assume it as an axiom in all their reasonings, or rather as what Aristotle calls an enthymematic γνώμη, that the nineteenth century (i. e. *because* the nineteenth) is superior to the first and second. We have been told much of late years about the early receptacles of religious truth having corrupted it by the pagan feelings or heathen learning with which they had been previously filled; or the testimony of the fathers has been considered as the mere *declarations* of individual *opinion*, not as assertions of the *fact* of certain widely spread and generally received doctrines. Their comments on Scripture, however unanimous in various times and countries, have been considered but glosses and fancies; as if it were the easiest thing in the world to get Jew and Gentile, bond and free, learned and unlearned, Roman and Alexandrian, to speak the same thing and to be joined together in one judgment,—as if Scripture itself did not give us an instance of the difficulty of making even “two false witnesses” “agree together,” in traducing Him whose doctrine it is considered so easy to deface. The fol-

* “Like him [Justin] he [Irenæus] is silent, or nearly so, on the election of grace, which from the instructors of his early age he must often have heard, and like him, he defends the Arminian notion of free will and by similar arguments. His philosophy seems to have had its usual influence on the mind, in darkening some truths of Scripture, and in mixing the doctrine of Christ with human inventions.”—*Milner*, vol. i.

lowing admirable remarks are a reply to this gratuitous hypothesis, which, instead of having proved to us, we are unceremoniously called upon to *disprove*.

“ There is, perhaps, a difficulty in steering between the opposite extremes of attributing too much or too little value to ecclesiastical antiquity. It is easy to say, on the one hand, that a stream is purest at no great distance from its source; and, on the other, that the world is much more enlightened now than it was eighteen centuries ago. The latter statement, however, may be fully acknowledged to be true, and yet may prove nothing as to the weight which ought to be given to the authority of the earlier ages.

“ We do not appeal to the primitive Christians for their knowledge or their opinions of matters upon which the world is now more enlightened; but a question arises, whether the world is really more enlightened upon those points with which the primitive Christians were specially concerned. These points are the doctrines which are essential to be believed as contained in the Gospel, and the method which is most likely to be successful for spreading them through the world. Whether these two points were imperfectly understood by the early Christians, and whether they have received more light from the discoveries of succeeding ages, are questions which it is not difficult to answer, if we rightly understand the nature of the Christian revelation.

“ The one word *Revelation* seems not suited to lead us to expect, that the matters which have been revealed would require, or could even admit, successive illustrations and improvements, from the powers of the human mind becoming more developed. If Christianity had been merely a system of moral precepts, which human reason had imagined and arranged, the system might undoubtedly be rendered more and more perfect as the world continued to advance. But, if the scheme of Christian redemption was not only revealed by God, but every part of it was effected by the agency of God, without man knowing anything concerning it until it was thus effected and revealed, it seems impossible that such a system could be modified or improved by later and successive discoveries.

“ Now it will not be denied, that the apostles themselves had the fullest and clearest understanding of the doctrines which they preached. It might, perhaps, be said, when their inspiration is taken into the account, that no Christians have had their minds equally enlightened by a knowledge of the Gospel; so that the revelation was, in its very commencement, full and complete; and to say, that we are more enlightened now as to the truths of the Gospel, would be the same as to say, that a ray of light is purer and brighter when it has reached the surface of the earth, than when it was first emitted from the sun. We must also recollect that the doctrine which the apostles preached, namely Justification by Faith in the death of Christ, could not be more or less complete at one period than another. It was complete, when Christ died, or rather when he rose again, and when God consented that faith in his death and resurrection should justify a sinner. The first person

who embraced this offer of reconciliation, at the preaching of the apostles, was as fully justified, and as fully admitted into the Christian covenant, as any person from that time to the present, or from now to the end of the world. The terms of salvation are precisely the same now as they were in the infancy of the Gospel. The only written record which we have of this last Revelation was composed by the persons to whom it was made; human reason has added nothing to the letter or the spirit of it: and whoever believes the doctrines which it contains, possesses all the knowledge which can be possessed concerning the salvation of his soul.

“ This being the case, it would seem to follow, that we have nothing else to do but to ascertain exactly what the doctrine is which was revealed, and, having ascertained it, to embrace it. This is, in fact, allowed by a vast majority of those persons who call themselves Christians. The notion, that Christianity admits of being improved as the world becomes more enlightened, can hardly be said to be entertained by any persons who really understand the Gospel; and though Christians are unhappily divided upon many fundamental points, they all agree in referring to the Scriptures, as containing the original Revelation; and each sect or party professes to believe its own interpretation of the Scriptures to be the best. It becomes, therefore, of great importance to know which of these conflicting interpretations was adopted by the early Church; and if it can be proved that any doctrine was universally believed in the age immediately following that of the apostles, the persons who hold such a doctrine now would naturally lay great weight upon this confirmation of their opinions.

“ It cannot fairly be said, that, in making this appeal to antiquity, we are attaching too much importance to human authority, or that we are lessening that reverence which ought to be paid exclusively to the revealed Word of God. It is because we wish to pay exclusive reverence to the Scriptures, that we endeavour so anxiously to ascertain their meaning; and it is only where our own interpretation differs from that of others, that we make an appeal to some third and impartial witness. We think that we find this witness in the early Christians, in those who lived not long after the time of the apostles; and though we fully allow that they were fallible, like ourselves, and though in sound critical judgment, their age may have been inferior to our own, yet there are many reasons why their testimony should be highly valued.

“ In the first place, they lived very near to the first promulgation of the Gospel. Even to a late period in the second century, there must have been many persons living who had conversed with the apostles, or with companions of the apostles. This would make it less likely that any doubts would arise upon points of doctrine, and, at the same time, more difficult for any corruption to be introduced. The simplicity of the Gospel was not in so much danger from the pride of learning and the love of disputation, when Christians were daily exposed to persecution and death, and when the fiery trial purified the Church from insincere or ambitious members. The language in which the New Testament was written made the early Christians better judges of the

meaning of any passages than ourselves ; for Greek continued for many centuries to be the language of the learned throughout the greater part of the Roman empire, and the Fathers of the three first centuries wrote much more in Greek than in Latin. These are some of the reasons why an appeal is made to the primitive Christians in matters of faith ; not that we receive any doctrine, merely because this or that Father has delivered it in his writings, but because the persons who lived in those days had the best means of knowing whether any article of faith had been really delivered by the apostles or not. And this testimony of the early Church becomes so much the stronger, if we find, as the following pages will show, that, for at least three centuries, there was a perfect unanimity among all the different churches upon essential points of doctrine."—p. 8—12.

We offer no apology to our readers for this long extract, as they will doubtless be desirous to know the sentiments of a writer of Dr. Burton's views upon the subject. The *principle* on which we consult antiquity is most satisfactorily stated in it ; not less satisfactory is the application of it on the whole, except indeed in one slight respect, which shall be noticed in the sequel, but which does not interfere with the decisiveness of the testimony afforded in it against the Socinianizing spirit of the day, a spirit which in one instance* has proceeded so far as to condemn St. Ignatius for his celebrated Epistles ; and next to ascribe to the Apostle Barnabas what the writer calls "a tissue of obscenity and absurdity which would disgrace the Hindoo mythology."

In the following passages we find the like clear and decisive statements on an article of faith, which has of late been much canvassed, that of the Holy Catholic Church.

"The unity of the Church had not as yet (A. D. 200) been broken by any open secession from the whole body of Christians. This body, though consisting of many members, and dispersed throughout the world, was yet one and undivided, if we view it with reference to doctrines, or to the form of ecclesiastical government. Every church had its own spiritual head or bishop, and was independent of every other church, with respect to its own internal regulations and laws. There was, however, a connexion, more or less intimate, between neighbouring churches, which was a consequence, in some degree, of the geographical or civil divisions of the empire. Thus the churches of one province, such as Achaia, Egypt, Cappadocia, &c., formed a kind of union, and the bishop of the capital, particularly if his see happened to be of Apostolic foundation, acquired a precedence in rank and dignity over the rest. This superiority was often increased by the bishop of the capital (who was called in later times, the metropolitan,) having actually planted the church in smaller and more distant places ; so that the Mother Church, as it might literally be termed, continued to feel a natural and parental regard for the churches founded by itself. These churches, however,

* *Vide* Mr. Osburn's *Primitive Errors*, pp. 25, 191, 256—290.

were wholly independent in matters of internal jurisdiction; though it was likely that there would be a resemblance, in points even of slight importance, between churches of the same province.

“ But early in the second century we find proofs of churches, not only in neighbouring provinces, but in distant parts of the world, taking pains to preserve the bond of unity, and to show themselves members of one common head.—The term *Catholic*, or *Universal*, as applied to the Church of Christ, may be traced almost to the time of the apostles; and every person who believed in Christ was a member of the Catholic Church, because he was a member of some particular or national Church, which was in communion with the whole body. We have already seen instances of this communion being preserved or interrupted between the members of different churches: and the anxiety of the early Christians upon this point is shown by the custom of bishops, as soon as they were elected, sending a notification of their appointment to distant churches. When this official announcement had been made, any person who was the bearer of a letter from his bishop, was admitted to communion with the church in any country which he visited: but these *communicatory letters*, as they were called, were certain to be denied him if any suspicion was entertained as to the unsoundness of his faith.—It may be supposed that these precautions were very effectual in preserving the unity of the Church, and in preventing diversity of doctrine. The result was, as has been already observed, that up to the end of the second century no schism had taken place among the great body of believers. There was no church in any country which was not in communion with the Catholic or Universal Church; and there was no church in any particular town or province which was divided into sects and parties.”—pp. 288—291.

The following passage is too important to be omitted, though it retraces in some measure the ground gone over in the last.

“ The term *Catholic* was applied to the church, as comprising the whole body of believers throughout the world, as early as the middle of the second century, and perhaps much earlier: and the preceding history has shown us how anxious the heads of the churches felt, in every country, that their members should hold communion with each other, and that this communion should not be extended to any who held sentiments at variance with those of the whole body. During the three first centuries, if a Christian went from any one part of the world to another, from Persia to Spain, or from Pontus to Carthage, he was certain to find his brethren holding exactly the same opinions with himself upon all points which they both considered essential to salvation; and wherever he travelled he was sure of being admitted to communion: but on the other hand, if the Christians of his own country had put him out of communion for any errors of belief or conduct, he found himself exposed to the same exclusion wherever he went; and so careful were the churches upon this point, that they gave letters or certificates to any of their members, which ensured them an admission to communion with their brethren in other countries.—The first dispute of any moment was that concerning the Paschal festival; but churches which differed upon this

point, continued to hold communion with each other ; and the bishop of Rome was thought decidedly wrong when he made this difference a cause of refusing communion. So strong a measure was only considered necessary, when the difference involved an essential point of doctrine." " Thus Theodotus, who did not believe the divinity of Christ, was excluded from communion, when he went to Rome. The same church excluded Praxeas for denying the personality of the Son and Holy Ghost : and when a doctrine somewhat similar began to spread in the Alexandrian diocese, the bishop who opposed it was so desirous to know that he was acting in agreement with other churches, that he sent copies of his own letters to Rome." " It is in this way that we are able to ascertain, at different periods of history, the sentiments entertained by the church, on various points of doctrine. We have also the works of the early Christian writers, which show that the Church maintained the same doctrines during the whole of the period which we have been considering. If we take any particular opinion, Sabellianism for instance, we know for certain that it was not the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Whenever it was brought forward by Praxeas, Noetus, Beryllus, or Sabellius himself, it was uniformly condemned, and that not merely by one writer, or by one church, but by the consentient voice of all the Eastern and Western churches. If we wish to know whether the divinity of Christ was an article of belief at the period which we have been considering, we find no instance of its being denied till the end of the second century, when Theodotus was put out of communion by the Roman Church for denying his belief in it. A few years later, Dionysius of Alexandria was obliged to defend himself from the charge of not believing it : and all the Eastern churches put forth their declaration from Antioch, that not only did they all maintain this article of belief themselves, but that it had been maintained by the Catholic Church from the beginning.—Creeds and confessions of faith were, during this period, and especially the former part of it, short and simple. While there were no heretics, there was no need to guard against heresy. Antidotes are only given to persons who have taken poison, or who are likely to take it : neither do we use precautions against contagion, when no disease is to be caught. The case, however, is altered, when the air has become infected, and thousands are dying all around us. It is then necessary to call in the physician, and guard against danger. The case was the same with the church, when she saw her children in peril from new and erroneous doctrines. When a member wished to be admitted, it was her duty to examine whether he was infected or not. The former tests were no longer sufficient. Words and phrases, which had hitherto borne but one meaning, were now found to admit of several ; and the bishops and clergy were too honest to allow a man to say one thing with his tongue, while in his heart he meant another. It was thus that creeds became lengthened, and clauses were added to meet the presumptuous speculations of human reason. But the fault (if fault it can be called) was with the heretics, not with the church. Her great object from the beginning had been unity."—pp. 424—428.

We have devoted more space to extracts illustrative of Dr.

Burton's ecclesiastical principles than we should have thought advisable, were the author any other than Dr. Burton; but his authority is such that we are not unwilling to produce it in behalf of doctrines which are at the present looked on in some quarters with not a little suspicion. The above passages will serve also to instance, to those who are unacquainted with his writings, the late Professor's perspicuous and easy, or, we might even call it, pleasant way of laying out a view before his readers, without any of that elaborateness or diffuseness of language which is frequently the failing of learned men.

The extract we shall presently give contains Dr. Burton's account of the income of the primitive clergy, and the mode of raising and apportioning it. Nothing is so common with Dissenters at this time as to defend their own Voluntary System by the custom, as they suppose it, of the Primitive Church; yet nothing surely is so unfair. The first ages have nothing in them either of the name or nature of *voluntariness*. No Christian system can be voluntary; except we mean to say, that it ever depends on our free will to receive it or not, and to be judged accordingly. The payments in the early Church were voluntary in that, and that sense only, in which our service to God is such. The word then, as not legitimately bearing this meaning, is an odious one, and becomes those and those only who think they may pass from Church to meeting, as they feel inclined. Nor was there any thing of the nature or the mischief of the Voluntary System of this day in the primitive economy. The mischief of it lies materially in this; that, when it is in operation, a preacher is paid in proportion to his popularity, so that a *bonus* is held out to him for flattering or indulging his audience. But the early Church considered the special gift of a Christian minister to lie, not in preaching, but in ministration of the sacraments, which was one and the same in all who were intrusted with it, and depended for its effect on the *faith* of the recipient, not on the talents of him who exercised it. Here is the true doctrine of salvation by faith, which the very men who make such a clamour about now-a-days, show by their mode of reasoning and teaching they understand least of all mankind. It is said, "*Thy faith hath made thee whole,*" not a running after preachers, not the eloquence, the fervour, or the knowledge of Scripture, or of the human heart, possessed by this or that individual. Nothing is required in the Christian system but God's act and our act; there is no medium interposed such that one man is better than another in his exercise of it. This minister and that minister are but *instruments*, or rather but the *same* instrument, where faith asks, and God answers. This is what the early Church held,

and in consequence, did a congregation demand it ever so much, they could not, as they themselves knew, in any way, or by whatever potent bribes, make their minister modify according to their wayward taste, the nature or the quality of that gift which God alone gave and they but passively conveyed, or act in rivalry with his brethren to please them. But not only so; the contributions of the faithful were thrown, as the following passage will show, into a common fund, from which the clergy were paid at the bishop's discretion. Where the bishop had the apportioning of the clergy's incomes, the people could make no discrimination between one of them and another. This is not our usage at this day, nor are we recommending it; but surely it was very different from the Voluntary System. So far, however, we would even go in the way of suggestion; in the noble design under agitation of building additional Churches in the metropolis, might it not be as well that *some such* rule were observed, to hinder those most mischievous inducements to popular preaching which the existing system of chapel building has fostered? Might not, for instance, the pew-rents be thrown into a common fund, to be dispensed by trustees or others, upon equitable and religious principles? Speaking of Natalis, or Natalius, a confessor who had lapsed to heresy, and taken the episcopate in it, at a monthly salary of 120 denarii, Dr. Burton says,—

“The fact of Natalius receiving a monthly payment for his services, may throw some light upon the method which was then established for the maintenance of the clergy: for though Natalius, in consequence of his heresy, was not at this time in communion with the Church, we may suppose that his followers adopted the custom which was then prevalent with the orthodox clergy. The principle had been expressly asserted by St. Paul, as well as supported by the analogy of the Jewish priesthood, and by the reason of the case itself, that the ministers of Christ should be maintained by their flocks. The apostles availed themselves of this privilege; and all those who were ordained to the ministry by the apostles, received their maintenance from the congregation in which they ministered. The common fund, which was collected by subscriptions from the believers, supplied this maintenance; and the poorer members, such as widows, and those who were destitute or afflicted, received relief from the same charitable source. We have no means of ascertaining the proportions in which this common fund was divided between the ministers of the word and the poor: and it appears certain that the distribution must have varied in different churches, according to the amount of sums contributed, and the number of applications for relief.—One fact has been preserved, that the management of the common fund was at the discretion of the bishop, who appointed the presbyters and deacons to their offices, as well as paid to them their stipends. The primitive and apostolic custom was preserved of the money being actually distributed to the poor by the hands of the deacons: but the sums allotted to

the respective claimants were settled by the bishop, who was probably assisted in this work by the presbyters of his church. The bishop himself received his maintenance from this common fund: and we know that in later times a fourth part of the whole was considered to belong to him. But when this fourfold division existed, one of the parts was appropriated to the repairs of the church; an expense which was not required, or in a very small degree, for at least the two first centuries, when the Christians had not been permitted to erect churches, but were in the habit of meeting at private houses. A small sum must always have been necessary for the purposes of congregational worship, even when thus simply and privately conducted: but we may conclude that the remainder of the common stock, after this moderate deduction, was divided between the bishop, his clergy, and the poor: although it does not follow that the proportions were equal, or always invariable. Natalius, as we have seen, a sectarian bishop, residing in Rome, received 120 denarii for a month's salary; and though we cannot suppose that the fund which was raised by a single sect, and that apparently not a large one, was equal to that which belonged to the Church; yet it is not improbable that the supporters of Natalius would be anxious to secure to him as good an income as that which was enjoyed by the bishops of the Church. If this was the case, it follows that the bishops, at the end of the second century, received a payment which equalled 70*l.* a year: or if it be thought that this cannot be taken as an average of the incomes of all bishops, which were certain to vary in different churches, we may at least assume that the income of the bishop of Rome was not less than the amount which has now been mentioned."—pp. 276—279.

As we have above alluded to the project for building additional Churches in London, it may be instructive to contrast with our present liberty of worship the distress and peril in which the early saints met for prayer and praise. We have no obstacle at this moment from without; they had none from within.

"He" [Alexander Severus] "may be said to have expressly tolerated their public worship: for when the keepers of a tavern claimed a piece of ground that had been occupied by the Christians, the emperor adjudged it to the latter, adding the remark, that it was better for God to be worshipped there in any manner, than for the ground to be used for a pothouse.

"The last anecdote might lead to an interesting inquiry into the period when the Christians first began to meet in churches, or at least to have buildings set apart for public worship. They probably acquired this liberty earlier in some countries than in others: but we can hardly doubt that some such buildings were possessed by them in Rome, during the reign of the present emperor. We know that, for many years, they met in each others' houses. Concealment, on such occasions, was absolutely necessary; and we may judge of the perils with which they were beset, as well as of the firmness of their faith, when we know that the excavations in the neighbourhood of Rome, which were formed by the digging of stone, were used for a long time by the Christians, as places

of religious meetings. In these dark and dismal catacombs, which may still be seen, and which still bear traces of their former occupants, the early martyrs and confessors poured forth their prayers to God, and thanked their Redeemer, that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name. Here also the remains of their dead were interred: and it was long before the intolerance of their enemies allowed the Christians to breathe a healthy air, or enjoy the light of heaven, while they were engaged in their sacred duties. This indulgence appears to have been gained at Rome during the period of comparative peace, which began on the death of Septimius Severus: but since Elagabalus prohibited every kind of public worship, except that of the Sun, we may perhaps conclude, that few, if any, religious buildings had been possessed by the Christians, till the time when Alexander decided the case in their favour.

“ At that time, they had a piece of ground belonging to them; and it appears to have been the property, not of some one individual who was a Christian, but of the whole community. It was probably bought out of the common fund, which has already been mentioned as belonging to the Christians: and the emperor's decision makes it plain, that it had been used for the purposes of public worship. It is not probable that the Christians met in the open air. The spot must, therefore, have been occupied by some building; which was either a private dwelling converted to this sacred purpose after its purchase by the Christians, or one which had been specially erected for the occasion. The latter conclusion would be the most interesting, as containing the earliest evidence of the building of churches: though it might be thought that the present edifice was rather of an inferior kind, since the opposite party intended to turn it into a tavern.”—pp. 316—318.

This transaction took place about A.D. 222—forty years later the See of Antioch had a house attached to it, which was recognized as being so by the Emperor Aurelian. On this account we the more wonder at the following sentence in the author's narrative of the times of Constantine, which seems to sink the primitive Church to the level of the Popish agitators in Ireland in this day.

“ It is plain from the terms of this edict, (one of Constantine's) that the Christians had for some time been in possession of property. It speaks of houses and lands which did not belong to individuals, but to the whole body. Their possession of such property could hardly have escaped the notice of the government; but it seems to have been held in direct violation of a law of Diocletian, which prohibited corporate bodies, or associations which were not legally recognised, from acquiring property. The Christians were certainly not a body recognized by law at the beginning of the reign of Diocletian; and it might almost be thought that this enactment was specially directed against them. But, like other laws which are founded upon tyranny, and are at variance with the first principles of justice, it is probable that this law about corporate property was evaded. We must suppose that the Christians had pur-

chased lands and houses before the law was passed : and their disregard of the prohibition may be taken as another proof that their religion had now gained so firm a footing, that the executors of the laws were obliged to connive at their being broken by so numerous a body."—pp. 418, 419.

As the volume before us is of a popular character, and upon controversial points of the history states but the conclusion to which its author had arrived, and which he has argued at length in his former works, it will not be necessary to notice any of them or examine what may be said for or against them. Every writer has a right to his own opinion in such matters, and a learned man like Dr. Burton, pre-eminently. One of these, however, we are tempted to say a few words upon, because it bears immediately upon the sacred text, and all men, not theologians only, have an interest in it. Dr. Burton considers James the Less, Bishop of Jerusalem, and brother or cousin of our Lord, as a different person from James the son of Alphæus, the Apostle. Without wishing to dogmatize on a point of this nature, we are somewhat surprised that he has been able to acquiesce in that view. In his lectures on the first century, he rests the proof of it on the testimony of antiquity, which he says is certainly in favour of the Bishop of Jerusalem not being one of the Twelve. But in the first place we are by no means sure that the authority of the Fathers in matters of *fact* connected with Scripture history, is greater than that of any one at this day. The personal history of the first propagators of the Gospel seems from the first to have been almost consigned to oblivion; and it is but in accordance with the height and grandeur of the system they administered, that it should be so. Doctrinal truth was carefully guarded, and transmitted; individuals, however illustrious, were passed by. How little is known about the labours and sufferings of the Apostles! while the result of them is clear, the establishment of the Church far and wide. In consequence, the early Christian writers, in attempting to trace the history of Christ and his Apostles, had no other resource than our own, viz. the attempt to glean from the sacred text what slight hints might therein be conveyed about it; and, having no means of information distinct from ours, they may as fairly be criticised or differed with as if they lived at this day. For instance, Theodoret speaks of St. James and St. Matthew as living together, and Chrysostom of St. James being a publican; can we doubt, under the circumstances, that this belief arose from St. Matthew being called the son of Alphæus as well as St. James? We have a parallel case in Dionysius's inquiry whether the author of the Apocalypse was the Apostle or another John. He plainly

knew no more of the matter than ourselves, and his opinion has no kind of *authority* over our belief. He argues the point critically, and ingeniously, from the structure of the book, and he comes to the conclusion that it is *not* the writing of St. John. As we do not feel bound in this case to adopt Dionysius's opinion, neither are we under any necessity to follow other Fathers, though they even did distinguish between James, Bishop of Jerusalem and James the Apostle. But in the next place the evidence from the Fathers seems not at all so clear, as at first sight might be thought. Dr. Burton refers to Eusebius, Epiphanius, Nyssen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, and the author of the Constitutions; but the true reading in Eusebius seems to speak just the reverse. Chrysostom elsewhere strongly implies there were but two, not three, disciples of the name of James; and Jerome thought sometimes one way, sometimes the other. On the other hand various Fathers called James the Less an Apostle, absolutely and without restriction. Thus after all we are cast upon the text of Scripture for our information; and, though it is certain that we read of James the Less in one place, of James the son of Alphæus in another, without any hint in those very places that the names did not belong to separate individuals; yet there is strong reason to conclude from other passages that they were but different designations of the same person. The text in the Galatians would seem decisive in the matter; "*Other of the Apostles I saw none, save James the Lord's brother.*" If it be said that the word *Apostle* extended beyond the twelve, being applied to St. Paul himself and St. Barnabas, this cannot be the case in this place, for in that sense St. Paul's declaration does not hold, as he *had* seen St. Barnabas at the season he speaks of. Indeed it seems almost incredible that James the Less should be spoken of as he is, if he were not one of the Twelve. For instance, when St. Paul first came to Jerusalem, St. Barnabas "took him and brought him *to the Apostles*;" that is, as the passage above referred to informs us, to Peter and *James*. It is James who presides at the Council of Jerusalem; it is James before whom St. Paul lays his proceedings on his coming up to Jerusalem after his Apostolic journey; it is as brother of James that the Apostle Jude designates himself, which hardly could be, were James short of an Apostle. Further, if the author of the Catholic Epistle be not an Apostle, it will be the only exception to the rule among the books of the New Testament; the Gospel according to St. Mark and St. Luke, not only being ultimately referable to Apostles, but being a narrative of our Saviour's teaching, not the teaching of the Evangelists themselves.

So much stress has been laid of late, in popular divinity, on one or two doctrines of the Gospel, apart from the rest, that it is not wonderful that Dr. Burton, a man of frank, accessible, and unsuspecting mind, and from his parochial habits especially likely to be brought under the influence of the current religion, should have sometimes worded himself in a way which he would be the first to lament, had he discovered whither it was tending. We hear frequent complaints about the evil of seclusion from pastoral labour, of learned leisure, and the like: this counterbalancing good, however, may be expected from it, that the old forms of thought and language will probably be retained in theological teaching, whatever happens in the world. The following passage will explain what we mean.

“The doctrine itself (the ‘new and strange doctrine, which was opposed to the prejudices and passions of mankind,’ which the Apostles had to preach,) may be explained in a few words. They were to preach faith in Christ crucified. Men were to be taught to repent of their sins and to believe in Christ, trusting to his merits alone for pardon and salvation; and those who embraced this doctrine were admitted into the Christian covenant by baptism, as a token that they were cleansed from their sins, by faith in the death of Christ: upon which admission they received the gift of the Holy Ghost, enabling them to perform works well-pleasing to God, which they could not have done by their own strength.”—pp. 23, 24.

Now, if by this statement it is only meant that the doctrines specified were those elementary portions of the Gospel which in matter-of-fact the Apostles preached to the unconverted as first steps in the Christian faith, it is quite borne out by the book of Acts. Yet we cannot help fearing that most readers, instead of considering it to speak of the first truths put before the minds of those whom the Apostles addressed, will conceive it to specify those which are highest and most sacred, and in such sense the *essence* of the Gospel, that, they being secured, every thing really important is secured with them. They will consider that all other doctrines, however true in themselves, however high in their subject, are but secondary, and only useful as ministering to the former and easily to be dispensed with in individuals, if the former are ascertained. Not that this single passage by itself need convey this, but that it seems to do so, interpreted, as it will be, by the mode of thinking and the language of the day. At this moment especially, when the orthodox doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, or Atonement, are so lightly treated in quarters where one might have hoped for better things, we regret the *accident*, for it is merely an accident, which makes Dr. Burton appear to put

those divine truths in the second place in the Christian scheme, in defence of which no late writer has been more zealous, more energetic, more unwearied than himself in former publications.

It is the same cause, a latent desire, as we conceive, to accommodate the ancient theology to the habits of this day, and to *explain* to his readers, in a manner level to their comprehensions, the abhorrence in which the then existing heresies were held by the early Church, which has led this most amiable and excellent man to *prove* the impiety of the Gnostics, not from their doctrine itself, but from the *consequences* of it. That doctrine *directly* contravenes the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation; but, as if feeling that the age would respond languidly to any charge of heresy on that score, Dr. Burton observes, what is quite true, but, as we should say, superfluous, that it *indirectly* denied the Atonement. He observes,—

“The name of Christ held a conspicuous place in the system of the Gnostics, but there were parts of their creed which destroyed the *very foundations* of the doctrine of the Gospel. Thus, *while* they believed the body of Jesus to be a phantom, and denied the reality of His crucifixion, they, *in fact*, denied their belief in the death of Christ, *and with it they gave up altogether the doctrine of Atonement.*”—p. 102.

He is not content with observing it once, but repeats it in a subsequent chapter:—

“He (Simon Magus) would not believe that Jesus had a real substantial body; he thought that a divine and heavenly being would never unite himself with what was earthly and material; and having heard of Christ soon after his ascension, before any written accounts of his birth and death were circulated, he formed the absurd and fanciful notion, that the body of Jesus was a mere spirit, or phantom, which only appeared to perform the functions of a man, and that it was not really nailed to the cross. *It has been already observed, that this impiety entirely destroyed the doctrine of the Atonement.*”—p. 154.

Nay, his anxiety on this point leads him to a *third* mention of it, as if he thought that theology must be *recognized* as practical, before it had any claims on the deference of the age.

“He (Basilides) therefore had recourse to the extraordinary notion that Simon of Cyrene was substituted for Jesus; which may remind the reader of what has been already observed, that Gnosticism entirely destroyed the doctrine of the Atonement: that Jesus Christ suffered death for the sins of the world, did not, and could not, form any part of the religious tenets of Basilides. *We are not, therefore, to be surprised that the heads of the Church took such pains to expose the errors of a system which, though it appears at first unworthy of a serious notice, was fatally subversive of the very foundations of our faith.*”—p. 201, 202.

Were it not that this volume is intended for general circulation under the joint authority of Dr. Burton's respected name and of the Literature Committee, we should not dwell on a point like this. But, considering this very serious circumstance, we think it right to call attention to one or two other passages of a similar complexion, that is, containing expressions, meaning nothing in the work itself, but which the divinity of the day will at once single out, appropriate, and triumph in.

In the first of the passages above quoted, the author speaks of admittance "into the Christian covenant by baptism," "as a *token* that they were cleansed from their sins by faith in the death of Christ." Now if we wished to be critical, we should object first of all to the phrase, "admittance into the Christian *covenant*," not for its own sake, (for it is in itself quite unobjectionable,) but as being a substitute for one which is much more comprehensive, "admittance into the Christian *Church*." This also is an accommodation in the writer to the temper of the day, which is much more willing to suppose that in baptism we enter into certain *relations* with Almighty God, than that we join a certain *society*. Of course baptism introduces us into a new state, but it does more than this, and we may be quite sure that where there is unwillingness to admit the received *language* of divinity, this is not an accident, a matter of taste, feeling, or habit, but rises from some lurking indisposition towards the *thing* which that language expresses. We have then some light cast upon the declension of this day's divinity from the standard of the Reformation, from the following observable fact, that in the baptismal service, while the expression of "admittance into the covenant" is not once found,—there occur on the other hand those diversified phrases of "received into Christ's holy Church;" "received into the ark of Christ's Church;" "remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children;" "we receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock;" "grafted into the body of Christ's Church;" "incorporate him into Thy holy Church." It is as clear as words can make it, that our Service contemplates the Church, whatever is meant thereby, (for that is quite a distinct question,) as a *definite instrument* in God's hands, *through* which baptized persons receive the promised blessings. It compares it to the ark of Noah, by which we escape "the waves of this troublesome world," and *in which* we are to be found at the last day, if we are to be "inheritors of God's everlasting kingdom." Substitute *covenant* for Church, as the privilege into which baptism admits us, and an entire doctrine is dropped out of the Christian scheme.

But, after all, it is the word "*token*," in the extract referred to,

which makes it necessary to dwell upon it. The author says that admittance by baptism is a *token* that they were cleansed from their sins by faith in the death of Christ. Why not a *means*? Yet this defective expression is used of the sacraments more than once. For instance,—

“ They immediately established the custom of meeting in each others' houses, to join in prayer to God, and to receive the bread and wine, *in token* of their belief in the death and resurrection of Christ. . . . Scarcely a day passed in which the converts did not give *this solemn and public attestation* of their resting all their hopes in the death of their Redeemer.” —p. 31.

“ Whether the dying penitent would have his pardon sealed in heaven or no, was not for man to decide; but it was not for man to prohibit him from testifying his faith by receiving the symbols of Christ's body and blood.”—p. 351.

In a sentence which soon follows, there is indeed an advance towards the higher truth; but not a decisive one. The author speaks of “ this solemn rite being considered the privilege, as it was the *blessing and comfort*, of sincere believers only.” Once more,—

“ If a man did not hold the articles of faith which were taught by the Church, he could not receive the bread and wine *which were taken as a proof of his holding this faith*.”—p. 425.

Surely they were taken as a “ blessing and comfort,” in the author's own words, or rather as a special channel of heavenly grace, on condition of his faith. Considering what is going on at present in the Christian Knowledge Society on the subject of baptism, we think its Literature Committee should reflect that these passages on the sacraments may be taken in an exclusive sense which the author did not contemplate, and would be the first to disown.

And now having given our readers some insight into Dr. Burton's work, we leave it for the study of those, an increasing number we trust, who think that an acquaintance with the early Church may tend to the edification of their own.

ART. XI.—1. *The National Church Re-adjusted*: A charge delivered to the Clergy of the County of Nottingham, in June, 1856, at the Annual Visitation of the Venerable Archdeacon Wilkins, D.D. London. Rivingtons.

2. *Proposals for rendering the Church Establishment Efficient*. By a Country Clergyman. Hatchard and Son.

3. *A few Words addressed to the Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Chapters, and generally to the Members of the Church of England*. By a Lay Episcopalian. Roake and Varty.

IN mentioning the words Church discipline and Church patronage, it is impossible not to revert for a moment to the case of Dr. Hampden. Yet we shall revert to it, not in the way of polemical debate, but simply as a matter of contemporary history.

The lamentable consequences of that appointment are beginning to be seen and felt. The Convocation, which was stopped by the Proctors of last year, has been held under other auspices; and the result has been the overwhelming majority against Dr. Hampden of 474 to 94, upon a point, which, though apparently trivial in itself, yet involves an important principle. For if Dr. Hampden be adjudged unfit to give one vote out of five in the appointment of select preachers in the University, how is he fit to teach and train, by his sole instructions, the candidates for Holy Orders, who will occupy the pulpits throughout the country in a few years?

Our object is to take the case of Dr. Hampden as an illustration of a departure from discipline arising from the misuse of patronage. For here is an appointment—not the result of a bare majority after the struggle of a disputed election;—not flowing from any inferior source of authority;—but issuing from the Crown itself as the great fountain of dignity and honour. Yet against this appointment a cry of sorrow, or indignation, or alarm, has sounded from the Clergy of the land. Nor have they been content with mere expressions of censure and distrust; but an actual resistance has been set on foot; an actual mark of disapprobation has been stamped: and the event may be, that the appointment will be virtually rescinded; and that the professor, made by the King as Head of the Church, will soon vacate the Chair in the University of Oxford. And by whom has this opposition been organized? Not by the Bishop, not by the Heads of Houses, but by an assemblage of men for the most part under forty years of age. Now, it is plain, that a disrespect has been thrown, from one quarter or another, upon the prerogative of the Crown; the King has been ill-treated either by the members of Convocation,

or by his own responsible advisers. The Majesty of England ought not have been placed in such a position. It is plain, too, that the whole proceeding, though not against law, not against precedent, has been a kind of democratical movement in the Church; a movement, as the leaders in the opposition to the appointment have invariably felt, which could only be justified by the occurrence of a very urgent emergency.

And what is the actual, present, undeniable position of the matter? It is a most serious and painful one to all well-wishers of the Church. As far as things can be in a state of schism, they are. There is one College at Oxford reported to signify an intention of recognizing, only or almost exclusively, the lectures of Dr. Faussett. On the other hand, one, if not two Bishops, have announced their purpose of taking none but the certificates of Dr. Hampden. Again, other two Bishops have declared that they will not take his certificates. Besides, how lamentable, how almost indecent is it, that two Divinity Professors should be reading lectures against each other, as has been the case during the last term. Now, the true friends of the Establishment will do well to look at all this mischief as a fact, without reference to the question which side is right, and which wrong. Such a state of things cannot last, if the Church is to be preserved from disorder and disorganization. And Dr. Hampden's removal may really become a measure of imperative necessity, unless the interests of the Church are to be altogether abandoned; unless schism is to creep up even into the Bench, and be enthroned in the high places of the Establishment.

Into the recent pamphlets, which contend either for or against Dr. Hampden, we have no spirits to enter. Alas! the waters of strife are already turbid enough, without being stirred. Wherefore, we forbear to notice the clever *conspectus* of Mr. Miller, the calm and logical letter of Mr. Woodgate; or to commend other efforts which well deserve our commendation. On the other side, we are happy to think that there can be no necessity for commenting on the taunts or the invectives, which, under the strange pretence of justifying Dr. Hampden, have been levelled against some as sincere, pious, and conscientious men, as any University in the wide world can boast. Many, indeed, of these pamphlets are filled with local *historiettes*, and personal matters, which are calculated to have wonderfully small currency or influence beyond Magdalen-bridge; and in which it can hardly be expected that Oxford and the rest of the empire should have much sympathy with each other. Still less can we perceive the use of such a publication as the one intitled "*Oxford Persecution in 1836: Extracts from the Public Journals.*" As a report or synopsis of

the whole case, these extracts are quite valueless; they are all on one side. But for what other purpose could it be worth while to scrape together the rubbish of anonymous contributors to obscure newspapers, or rake the worthless embers into a heap so as to keep alive the fire of irritation? *One* end, however, this compilation, as well as other things, may serve. It may show the different tone which has been adopted by the opponents and the supporters of Dr. Hampden. It may show on which side are the real virulence, the real persecution, the real intolerance;—the black and out-poured venom of calumnious attack and sneering ribaldry. We allude chiefly, of course, to the nameless slanderers; not to the clergymen or laymen who have openly taken part in the contest. For the rest, we are anxious *not* to quarrel with Mr. Baden Powell: and we have left some of his former statements, in which he has misrepresented and probably misunderstood our meaning, unanswered on this account.* Still less are we inclined to turn an inch out of our way for the purpose of replying to the somewhat childish innuendo of Mr. Grinfield. We ought, perhaps, in common compassion, to be silent about the Article in the *Edinburgh Review*, and its presumed author, Dr. Arnold, a man, whom we did not expect to find writing in such a temper, and whose name we grieve to see made notoriously public in the business, whether by inordinate vanity or lamentable indiscretion. Besides, the matter has fallen into good hands. A very just and powerful castigation has been administered by Mr. Churton, who has given us, as the last, so one of the very ablest productions, which this unhappy controversy has called forth.

Of that Article, however, we shall just say, what we happen to know. It has been more injurious to the cause of Dr. Hampden than any thing else, which has been written on either side of the question. It has, in several cases, decided the doubtful, and confirmed the wavering, making them vote against a man, in whose behalf such arguments and such expressions could be deemed requisite. Its title and its contents have done him equal mischief. Many, who feared that it would seem want of charity to press hard upon the Regius Professor, felt that it would now be want of principle not to range themselves on the side of his opponents. Even private regard for the individual gave way to the necessity of openly proclaiming an affectionate reverence for the Church, now maligned, insulted, and calumniated in the persons of its staunchest defenders. Such defenders, it was seen, were to be defamed,

* As a specimen, however, of the random way in which Mr. Powell flings about his reproofs, we may remark that he accuses us of blundering about the word "*facts*," because we have not read Butler:—when it happens, that the very passage in Butler which bears most upon the point at issue was appended to that very inaugural Lecture of Dr. Hampden on which we were passing our comments.

traduced, and persecuted in a manner the most extraordinary and the most wanton: and the very emotions, so to speak, of gallantry and honour, which might otherwise have prevented men from bearing down Dr. Hampden, now hurried them to the support of Mr. V. Thomas, Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Newman. For these, we suppose, are *the malignants*! And we might just ask, what one *malignant* has done in furtherance of the Bishop of London's project for building and endowing new Churches—or what is the private character and the ministerial conduct of another "*malignant*;" or how the "*malignants*" in general have upheld the Establishment, not by empty phrases, but by substantial deeds, and unwearied labours, and the bright lustre of their living examples? Would to heaven, that we could all of us become such *malignants*!

One great argument, indeed, for the weakness of Dr. Hampden's cause is, we cannot but think, the manner in which it has been conducted. The chief effort has been to make a diversion in his favour, by carrying a fierce attack into the quarters of his adversaries. But this course, although it may be justifiable and prudent in many cases, seems quite inapplicable to the present. Dr. Hampden has been appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. The question is about the propriety of that appointment. It, therefore, turns altogether upon the opinions and qualifications of Dr. Hampden, not upon the opinions and qualifications of other men. A. is nominated to a very important trust: an objection is urged to certain sentiments delivered, printed, and published, which are supposed likely to vitiate the character of his theological instructions: and the objection is met by the assertion of opposite errors on the part of C. and D. We need not say to persons who can reason, that this mode of proceeding is either arrant trifling, or disingenuous artifice. Every *argumentum ad homines*, every specimen of the "*tu quoque*," every recriminatory charge, made with whatever force and dexterity—how does it bear upon Dr. Hampden's principles, or the effect of his teaching with reference to the youth of the University and the rising generation of divines? How could a confutation of Dr. Pusey or Mr. Newman be a vindication of Dr. Hampden's mistakes? The notion is preposterous. If the advocates of the Regius Professor could prove their heaviest imputations upon the soundness of other men's theology, still the strictest demonstration would be *nihil ad rem*. But they cannot prove a particle of them. They must indeed undertake to prove that the tenets of all the clergymen of the Church of England, with the exception of a really minute fraction, are erroneous and heterodox. For Churchmen of all shades of doctrine flocked up with a si-

multaneous spontaneity, to oppose Dr. Hampden. But the principal shafts are aimed against a few distinguished "*malignants*." To them are addressed the serious rebukes and the ironical praises, the Encyclical Letters, and the Pastoral Epistles, from his Holiness the Pope. . . As if their aim was to abet Popery, instead of placing the refutation of it upon the right grounds; so that the cause of truth may not be abandoned to the well-intentioned but weak-minded zealots, who, if left to themselves, would soon manage, on several momentous points, by a most unfortunate ingenuity, to put Protestantism in the wrong.

But the Oxford malignants need not our defence. . . Faction—party-spirit—selfish interest—political venality—even these motives have been imputed to them; although the charges can only attest the folly as well as injustice of their accusers. In these respects, at least, their high-souled independence and disinterestedness must be beyond the reach of impeachment, and even calumny. In these respects, at least, Oxford may glory in her sons, and England may be proud of her University. And England is proud. We may thank God, that, even in these days of cowardice and vacillation, and that wretched short-sightedness, which is miscalled expediency, England knows how to value the solid steadiness of purpose, the unswerving devotion to a sense of right, the depth and consistency of religious principle, which ennoble her seats of learning, and bear the best witness to the sterling nature of the education which they confer. For these are the things which bind around their brows a crown of more august and sacred grandeur than the most illustrious conquests of war and even of science could ever gain. We are not asking, it will be observed, whether the leading men of Oxford and Cambridge have been always correct in their views and anticipations. On some points, we may have held, and we may hold, opinions not quite in unison with theirs. But we still feel, that we cannot be too thankful to them for the moral greatness of their conduct; or pay too large a tribute of admiration and gratitude to the firm and inflexible sincerity, the unalterable fidelity to perhaps a sinking and unpopular cause, the utter disregard of personal consequences, not to be awed by the menaces of power, not to be intoxicated by the incense of adulation. We may almost borrow, with a slight change, the fine old hyperbole, which has helped to immortalize the memory of the Roman, and say that it were easier to move the sun from his course, than to shake the column of their unbending integrity. And this sturdy attachment to a supposed duty,—how far has it been from a blind and bigoted partizanship! When the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel were in the zenith of their strength, Oxford had her hundreds who would rather have

forfeited every hope of human advancement, than have made, or countenanced, concessions, which, as they regarded them, savoured of apostacy. And the same men, or men of the same stamp as they, then held persons in honour, but revered principles more than persons; so now they have wished for peace, but they love religion more than peace.

But our feelings are here leading us away; and we may be losing sight of our general inquiry, even in the particular matter by which we would illustrate it. That matter is now before us simply by way of *instance*. For ourselves, we have not the honour of any acquaintance with Dr. Hampden: but we can feel for the situation, into which rash and injudicious patrons have thrust him, to his almost torturing annoyance. We most sincerely regret that a man, whose personal qualities have secured the warmest affection and respect of all who know him, should have been placed in a position which has compelled other men, as esteemed, as learned, as amiable as himself, to visit him with censure, and carry against him, by an enormous majority, a vote which implies want of confidence.

We would put the questions—not in the name of the Church, for in the name of the Church we can have no right to put them, but in the name of ourselves, and of those who may think with us; can any possible good arise from Dr. Hampden's appointment at all commensurate with the actual mischief, which it has already caused?—Is the system of such appointments to be continued? Is it worth while for Ministers, either as friends to the Church, and such a friendship they profess, or as friends to their own interests, and such a friendship they must undoubtedly entertain, to unite against them those two great sections of the establishment, which, on other points, may be only too ready to differ between themselves? Is it worth their while to place an appearance of disagreement between the body of the Church and the temporal head of the Church? Is it worth their while, to proceed with offensive nominations in defiance of at least nine-tenths of the English Clergy? We say, at least nine-tenths; for many even of those, who voted on a late occasion in Dr. Hampden's favour, ranged themselves on his side, not because they participated in his opinions, or thought his published theology unexceptionable; but because they had a keen perception of the inconveniences which might accrue, from resisting an appointment, when absolutely settled by the Crown. Yet we cannot be blind to indications, and deaf to rumours, which seem to render a perseverance in obnoxious appointments, on the part of his Majesty's advisers, more than probable. We would, therefore, pursue our inquiries upon a hypothetical case: and we are anxious to pursue

it, while the case is hypothetical, and before we are again reduced to the wretched and distressing necessity of making personal objections to a particular individual, whose private character may command attachment and esteem. We would pursue it quite frankly and freely; because we feel that we can pursue it with a clear conscience, which acquits us altogether of malignant motives. Our constant aim has been to hold ourselves aloof from the mere ferment of parties; and to examine the great questions which affect our Christian interests, as if standing calmly on the bank, without being sucked into the whirlpool of factious rivalries. We cannot fairly be charged with political hostility. The accusation against us has been urged, and is more plausible, that we have exhibited too little warmth on subjects, where a man's politics become a part of his religion.* We speak, therefore, not as the adherents or the foes of any set of statesmen; but as men who would bitterly lament that an established and aggravated enmity should exist between the government of the country and the Church of the country, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian.

The inquiry, which we would institute, is about the principle on which Church-patronage is to be bestowed; or, to state it in another form, the class of persons who are to be elevated among our hierarchy. There may be a disposition to take the masters of our principal schools, *on account of their preceptorship*; as if the task of ordering boys was the best preparation for the task of managing mankind. But, although there have been, and are, and, we dare say, will be, some splendid exceptions, our belief is, that there is no real parity between the government of a school and the administration of a Diocese; and that the most successful pedagogue is not likely, as such, to be the most judicious Bishop; both from the experience which he must want, and the habits with which he has been conversant. There may be an inclination, again, to exalt into spiritual peers men, whose views as to creeds and articles, the regulation and polity, and even the theoretical constitution of a Church, must create a radical difference of sentiment between themselves and almost all with whom they will have to come in contact. But we will not imagine—for it is a spectacle which, happily, we have not hitherto been called to behold—the soreness and irritation, half-vented and half-smothered, which must rumble, with a scarcely subterranean current, through

* Upon that most important and somewhat confused question, the connection between politics and religion, we would refer to an admirable discourse in Mr. Newman's third volume; and also to a volume of Sermons recently published by the Rev. W. Gresley—a volume sensible, practical, and valuable, both on this and other accounts. It is intitled "*Sermons on some of the Social and Political Duties of a Christian, with a Preface on the Usefulness of Preaching on such Subjects.*"

a diocese, where the Bishop should be an object of suspicion; the utter absence of that kind and almost paternal relation, in which a Prelate ought to stand towards his Clergy; the sense of disliked authority on the one part, and the lack of cheerful obedience on the other.

A correspondent has requested us to remonstrate against the prevalent system of putting very important trusts upon very young shoulders. And certainly, a damage must thus be inflicted both upon the country at large, to which the prudence of middle age existing among its sons might be in a measure lost; and upon the persons themselves, of shining talents and vast future capabilities, who should be invested with the most laborious and responsible charges too early in life; before they could have enjoyed the fittest preparation for command in the school of obedience; before their character would be formed and all its elements harmonized; before that moral stability could be consolidated in the mind and heart, which, next to the divine influences of religion, can best prevent men from being too lowly or too aspiring—too self-distrusting, or too self-confident. Hereafter we may return to this subject as a not uninteresting or trifling question in social economy; but, although the two matters have clearly their connexion, our present argument has reference to the qualifications, rather than to the age, of the parties who may be exalted to the highest stations of the Church of England.

In that work of so much performance and so much promise, "*The History of England, from the Peace of Utrecht*," there is a passage full of warning, which may become applicable to our times, although we thank God, in all sincerity, that things have not yet come to such a pass as to make it applicable now. Lord Mahon writes; "The Earl of Nottingham concluded an eloquent speech with a bitter and impressive allusion to Swift, whose favour with the ministers was now firmly established and generally known. 'My Lords,' he said, 'I have many children, and I know not whether God Almighty will vouchsafe to let me live to give them the education I could wish they had. Therefore, my Lords, I own I tremble when I think that a certain divine, who is hardly suspected of being a Christian, is in a fair way of being a bishop, and may one day give licences to those who shall be intrusted with the education of youth.'"

Now, we repeat, in order to prevent all possible misconstruction, that things *have* not come—we trust, they never *will* come—to such a pass as this. But we would look to a wide principle, to the tendencies of a system, and to the probabilities of the future. We can at least conceive Ministers of the Crown who would heap all their patronage upon clergymen, if they could

find them, of one peculiar party in politics—and that one peculiar party, the party hostile to the constitution of the empire. We can conceive a profligate, flagitious, and traitorous administration, endeavouring, even wantonly and by design, to bring Episcopacy, as an order, into disgrace and contempt, by exalting unworthy persons to the Episcopal dignity; and striving to throw ridicule upon the theory of apostolical succession, by preferring, one after another, a race of unapostolical men. If ever such an administration should arise, there would be no terms of indignant rebuke, of burning and withering execration, in the whole vocabulary of the English language, too strong or too explicit for brands of infamy upon their conduct. We should not then shrink from the performance of a fearful duty: but we should cry out for the impeachment of those ministers with as austere a determination as the most vehement zealot in the kingdom. In the mean time, however, there seems danger of another kind, which may be scarcely less disastrous in its ultimate consequences.

A bishop should now be a guide and umpire, ruling with a firm and delicate hand, amidst a variety of conflicting opinions and conflicting practices. What will happen, if men should step upon the bench, with their own experience so slight, their own sentiments so unsettled, that they hardly care which is which, or know one from the other? The nation needs some men in the high places of her Church who are not only versed in parochial details, but have exhibited skill, and temper, and Christian discretion in the government of parishes: men who are acquainted, not merely with the truths of theology, but with the application of theology to the people: who practically understand the state of national feeling and education: who have taken their share in the conduct of the great Christian Societies of the land: who have had clerical and ecclesiastical affairs to manage, and who have succeeded in their management. What must happen, if a school, or a college, is to be the only antechamber to the House of Peers; or if the main requisite for a bishopric is to be a mastery of the differential calculus, or an addiction to oryctological research?

But let us not be mistaken. The pestilent notion that extraneous knowledge is injurious or useless to a clergyman, is at the very antipodes of our belief. A clergyman, we hold, cannot possess too large a variety of general information, provided it be made consistent with his professional avocations; and the one needful study be not neglected for the adjuncts and embellishments. In fact, if he is behind his age: if, in any region of inquiry or intelligence, he exhibits a marked and palpable deficiency, he must risk—he will probably forfeit—some portion of his clerical influence and power. At a period, also, when much

may turn upon right views of material phenomena, he who can blunt the edge of every weapon forged against Christianity in the armoury of physical science; he who can render geological and mineralogical pursuits auxiliaries, as Dr. Buckland and Mr. Conybeare have rendered them, to the cause of religion, does us an eminent service, and may well ask our fervent gratitude as its return. We are impressed with the conviction, that arguments for or against revelation will be drawn, more and more, from the entire compass of the universe, the whole encyclopædia which treats *de omni scibili*. Too many attainments of knowledge, too many accomplishments of literature, cannot, therefore, be clustered around the theological learning and the pastoral employments of a minister of the Gospel. But, nevertheless, this learning, these employments, must continue to be his primary, and paramount, and central aim; and other things are to be subordinated to them, and regarded as their auxiliaries, and cultivated chiefly for their sake.

Our admissions, therefore, do not go one step to prove, that the highest prizes in the Church ought to be bestowed on account of recommendations altogether *extra-professional*; or, in other words, upon persons who are distinguished by their scientific character, but have, properly, no clerical or theological reputation. We may even say, that scientific acquirements ought, in many cases, to be an additional weight in the balance of desert, and allowed, *cæteris paribus*, to turn the scale of favour: we may be glad, that the Bench of Bishops should represent, as it were, all the claims which the Clergy of England have upon the respect and admiration of their country-men:—but we still remain impreguably intrenched in our general position.

That general position is, that, while we rejoice to have Clergy who possess enlarged and liberalized minds, and who have expanded their views through the circle of many sciences, still we need men in our hierarchy who have mounted through the clerical offices step by step; and have occupied a space in the eyes of their brethren, being known and revered in a theological or ministerial capacity. The assumption of a dignity will exert no magical influence to change the man who is invested with it. It will not make that man a good divine, who has never studied divinity: nor that man competent to superintend the exertions of a body of clergy, who is himself destitute of all pastoral experience; who has, perhaps, been less conversant with his living fellow-creatures, than with the gigantic lizards of a pre-Adamite world; who may have examined into the stratification of earths, rather than into the succession of human emotions; who may have dived into the caves of the sea-shore, more than into the recesses

of his own spirit ; who may be more disposed to break the stone on the mountain, than to soften what has been called the granite of the soul ; and more able to ascertain the bones of a mammoth, than to deal with feelings which are not fossilized, and passions which are not petrifications. Of such a man it may be true ; he gathers to himself an European fame. Let him enjoy it. He acquires wealth and reputation by honourable and lucrative employment in the tuition of youth. He deserves it all. He is engaged in some of the noblest and most elevating contemplations which can occupy the mind of man. That sublime satisfaction who shall grudge him ? But to lift a man to the topmost pinnacles of the Ecclesiastical Establishment, *because* he is a good geologist, or *because* he is a good astronomer ; or even *because* he is a good classical or mathematical tutor ; *because* he has measured the distances of the stars, or devised a physical theory of the globe which we inhabit, is a practical *non sequitur* of the most awful kind. It confounds all things, that a man should be eminent in *one* way, and, *therefore*, rewarded in another. And the system might, in fairness and consistency, be extended beyond the inquirer, whose talk is of marl and schist, and to whose mind plesiosaurs and ichthyosaurs are familiar images, to another, if the alliterations may be allowed us, who is learned in Linnæus, and whose life has been busied about butterflies.

The Church is a profession. And the rewards and honours of the profession ought to be given to men the most distinguished for professional superiority. Celebrity in extraneous endowments and pursuits ought not to be the passport to its most exalted stations. Nothing can be so fatal to the well-being of a profession as to confer the foremost places in it upon persons known, solely or chiefly, upon other grounds. You thus degrade it of necessity. You impair the stimulus to regular exertion in it. You induce the ablest and most energetic men to take a bye-path as the shortest and surest road to its distinctions. Most of all, you degrade the Church. You debase divinity as a thing secondary and subservient to the acquisitions, which should be its supplements and its ornaments ;—but not its substitutes.

We say then, *first*, that the most dangerous and baneful of all precedents is to assign the highest honours of a profession to men who have not made that profession their leading study ; but who have subordinated their professional to their general pursuits. Some such experiments have been made, once or twice, in the law ; but they are not considered to have been remarkably successful. We say, that *any* profession must be degraded, if men in power award its first prizes for merits—even transcendent merits—other than professional. For, by the same rule, they might

give a field-marshal's baton to the soldier, who should be most expert in chemical manipulations; or they might make Serjeant Talfourd a judge, because he has written a good tragedy, or exalt a man far less distinguished than Serjeant Talfourd, because he has furnished some smart papers on general politics. In fact, there is no end to the anomalies and mischiefs, which must grow out of such a system.

But we say, *secondly*, that, in the sacred profession of the Church, the mischiefs of such a course are aggravated, beyond all power, not merely of expression, but of conception. No other department of human life can afford a just measure of the guilt of entrusting the general direction of men, on whose labours thousands of souls may depend for life or ruin, to one who is a Clergyman merely from the accident of being the Tutor or Fellow of a College:—or one, who is quite out of the stream of clerical habits and ministerial pursuits:—or one, who knows more about pieces of rock than knotty points of divinity, and has had a hammer in his hand more often than his Bible.

Under these circumstances, we call upon the ministers to pause and beware what they are doing. If they pursue a headlong course of making obnoxious appointments, one after another, they will convert into stern and inexorable enemies, not merely the political parsons, who canvass at elections; not merely the declaimers, who seek a public notoriety at Exeter Hall; not merely the few inflammable rhetoricians, who thunder out eloquent speeches after dinner at a tavern, or in a theatre; but the whole body of the Church of England,—her consistent dignitaries,—her vigilant pastors,—her accomplished writers,—her profound divines. They will raise against them, not a passing tempest, but a majestic and enduring element, of serious, solemn, high-principled, Christian opposition, which no government can resist; or, if it does resist, can resist only by the aid of revolutionary allies, who will erect a wild democracy upon the prostrate fragments of the British constitution.

Another and a momentous consideration is the consideration of *time*. It must be recollected that the prerogative of the bishops is now to be stretched; that a larger jurisdiction, and more summary means of correcting the delinquencies of the subordinate clergy, are to be placed within their grasp. Hence, in the first application of a new system, it will be essential to the well-being of the Establishment, that the authority should be vested in persons, in whose hands it will be regarded with a cordial respect, rather than with any emotions of fear or misgiving. The consequences may be most painful, if the screws of authority should be tightened at the same moment that the sentiments of affection and

reverence hang loose; if there should be at once a tension of the legal power, and a diminution of the moral. For thus the very increase in the strictness of discipline might help to tear and shatter the edifice of the Church, like an iron roof expanding or contracting more than the stone-work, and the brick-work, and the wood-work would admit.

That uneasiness is felt and manifested it were idle to deny. Nor, perhaps, is it altogether without reason. On the one part, Dr. Wilkins, an archdeacon delivering a charge to the clergy, talks of the *readjustment* of the Church; talks of the Church being *renovated* and *remodelled* by a board of commissioners, whose determinations, according to the archdeacon, are to be final and absolute, the legislature having little more to do than register their edicts, and the clergy nothing but to obey them. On the other part, the inferior clergy, as a mass, begin to be startled, if not alarmed. They see that the internal regulation of the Church, and the internal distribution of its property, are to be definitively arranged, without even the form of asking their concurrence. Hence they demand a convocation. They complain that everything is to be done *for* them and suffered *by* them; that they are to be made the perpetual objects, or victims, of legislation; but that they are to have no share in it, and almost no voice. And, although we have very distinct apprehensions of the difficulties and the probable mischiefs which must attend a revival of Convocation, we hardly know how the request of the clergy is to be resisted, if agitation on the subject is once seriously and strenuously set on foot; and really agitation, of all kinds, and in all places, has now become so profitable a business, that our wonder is, why every body does not take it up. Many of the clergy—perhaps very many—are anxious for some authorized mode of expressing their sentiments, and consulting with one another. For ourselves, we do not want a convocation; but we do want an ecclesiastical synod, which may decide certain points of doctrine and discipline; more important to our minds than even the settlement of tithes,—far more important than the exact size and shape of a parish, or the task of rounding off the corners of a diocese.

However, our present purpose is neither to dogmatize, nor to conjecture, nor to argue disputed points. It is simply to show the actual tendency of the state of our ecclesiastical affairs. Now, they tend, as it appears to us, to despotism on the one side, and to democracy on the other. And the danger is, lest the Establishment should be pulled to pieces between the opposite impulses. By a despotism, be it understood, we do not mean the tyranny of any particular prelates, but the kind of summary and domineering legislation which is inflicted upon the Church and

clergy. By a democracy, we mean partly a not unnatural reaction against this despotism, and partly an exhibition, perhaps an unconscious one, even among the clergy, of the popular spirit of the times, by which unauthorized individuals would take matters into their own hands, and make the will of the majority a law which allows of no appeal. Certain it is, in our opinion, that, in some respects, the cords of discipline are strangely loosened; in others, the assumptions of authority are pushed much too far.

Our humble advice to the clergy has been, that, almost to the extremity of Christian endurance, they should bear and forbear. It has been our uniform endeavour to soothe acerbities and to prevent violence. But it is our fate, from the nature of our position, to hear notions put forth in conversation, and see them promulgated in print, which could hardly have found countenance in a happier and healthier state of things. Thus we hear and see a severance from the legislature recommended, upon the model of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and America. For men begin to deem it better that there should be no connection between Church and State, than that the Church should recognize an affinity where the State is only as a step-mother, ready to despoil and harass, but unwilling to support and uphold. In this case, even more than in the case of convocations, we would earnestly deprecate all extreme and unadvised proceedings; but we are taught what others think of the disease, when they can talk of having recourse to these desperate remedies.

By way of verifying our statements, we would merely refer to the published sentiments of Mr. Kempthorne, Mr. Willis, and Mr. Close; and extract one or two brief extracts from the charge of Archdeacon Wilkins; as also from the other pages, which, straws as they are, may yet show the direction of the wind.

Dr. Wilkins says,—

“The present time constitutes an æra in the Church, second only in importance to the period of the Reformation, when the national religion, after various convulsions, settled down into that solid form, which, as far as doctrine is concerned, it has preserved in purity to this day; and which, being based on the rock of Scripture, it is calculated to preserve as long as we continue a Church and nation.”—p. 3.

“In this period of returning calm, our government has wisely determined to employ a dispassionate and enlightened commission, consisting of the highest officers of Church and State, to remodel the Establishment, and to diffuse its limited resources over as wide a space as they can be spread.”—p. 7.

“I feel a conviction that it is not only for our benefit as a body, but that it is for our very existence as an Establishment, that this reform be received in the spirit in which it is made; that it is our wisdom, as it will become our duty, to co-operate with its provisions to the utmost in

our power, and that we show a ready and a cheerful compliance with all its enforcements. In a measure of this important nature we must lay aside all our own fancies and schemes of improvement, and acquiesce in the judgment of those who are actuated by the purest motives, in whose friendly feelings as well as in whose mature wisdom we may confide, and who, having every necessary particular, and the result of every inquiry fully placed before them, are alone qualified, upon a calm investigation of them, to decide upon whatever is best calculated to uphold the venerable structure and to quicken it with life and energy."—pp. 7, 8.

"The bishops will be empowered to require, at their discretion, two full services in every parish in their respective dioceses, whatever may be the value of the benefice, or the extent of population. And in every case where the benefice amounts to £150, and the population to 400, it will be imperative on the bishop to insist upon the same. These alterations will necessarily require the intervention of additional curates, all of whose future salaries, graduated in amount by the existing scale of population, are to be fully secured to them without collusion by either of the contracting parties."—pp. 16, 17.

"With respect to the matters of discipline which the next part of the general Report of the Commissioners may be expected to recommend, provision will assuredly be made for the future adjudication of clerical delinquencies, by bringing all charges of that nature under Episcopal jurisdiction. Here will be an additional and painful duty imposed upon the diocesans; but as it is essential to our character and constitution that good government should be preserved, and that justice should be administered by those who bear lawful rule over us, a power must be given to the bishops to take cognizance, and to impose summary restraints and penalties upon those whose misconduct disgraces their profession, and to withhold from such the exercise of public ministration."—p. 19.

"What further means beyond these are to be adopted for the maintenance of public ministration, or for due controul and superintendence over the clergy and their churches, will shortly be developed, upon bringing up that part of the report to which I have alluded. *That their several recommendations, with little or no variation, will be carried into immediate effect, there can be no doubt*; and for the security and well-being of the Establishment, and the advantage of the public, it is desirable that there be as little delay as is compatible with sufficient and calm deliberation."—pp. 20, 21.

"And now, my reverend brethren, with all the outward aids to which I have alluded;—with our establishment renovated, and all its various machinery improved;—with the countenance and support of the well-informed and well-conducted orders of society;—and, let us hope, with the returning confidence of others who have been opposed or indifferent to us,—be it our earnest endeavour to discharge our relative duties with all the zeal and energy, the devotion and ardour, that it becomes the ministers of Christ to manifest in the great and mighty cause of the

Gospel ; that Gospel which opens the only way to heaven to fallen, sinful man."—pp. 26, 27.

Now, we concur, in the main, with the Archdeacon's admonitions : and they may save us from examining more deeply, at the present moment, into the Reports of the Commissioners. At the same time, a quotation from the Lay-Episcopalian may convince Dr. Wilkins and many others, that no *re-adjustment* of the Church will be successful, and that no "*patent renovator*" is to be found ; unless the members of the Church at large shall be satisfied with the hands, to which an increased power is committed : for that otherwise they will not be pleased or acquiescent more than an army will move with alacrity and zeal, when it can place no reliance in its superior officers. The "*Country Clergyman*" favours us with a scheme for "*rendering the Church efficient ;*" and the Lay-Episcopalian contends :

"As the British Magazine says, if heretical doctrines prevail in the Church, there will be a great schism, 'a resolute separation of the healthy from the unhealthy portion ;' if those who are constituted the guardians of our Christianity, will not defend, but will betray it, *then* we must, at whatever cost, take care of it for ourselves, and in my own name and in that of thousands of others, of all the adherents to our Liturgy and Articles, I may, I doubt not, declare that we will not accept any change whatever in that Liturgy, or in those Articles, which is not sanctioned by persons in whom we can place confidence, who by their preaching and writings are known to be firm adherents to our fundamental doctrines ; that we will accept no new religion which sceptical professors or bishops may attempt to impose upon us, and that we will neither frequent churches nor listen to preachers where either such new religion is celebrated, or where the articles of our creed are either denied, or not fully and faithfully upheld ; we will at whatever cost 'come out and be separate, and touch not the unclean thing,' always remembering that 'purity of faith is more precious to the Christian than unity itself.' See British Magazine for March, 1836, p. 239. And we will form among ourselves, as the Episcopalians of Scotland did when Presbyterianism became the established religion of that country, an Episcopal Church unconnected with the state, in all respects the same as the Episcopal Church in Scotland."—pp. 10, 11.

The subjoined note, again, is curious.

"An appeal has lately been made to every Christian to promote the erection of new churches ; but, in the name of common prudence, let Christians pause, and, before they do this, obtain *something like a rational assurance* that *Christianity*, and not Socinianism, Rationalism, or Latitudinarianism, is to be taught and inculcated in those churches ; let them either obtain this guarantee, or let them refuse to contribute one single farthing, for they will have to build orthodox churches and

chapels *for themselves*, unconnected with an establishment which has forsaken the true and pure religion of the Gospel.—*Ibid.* p. 10.

It is melancholy to find any members of the Church giving utterance to language such as this: for what can ensure the Church from demolition, but the strong unflinching attachment of the mass of the clergy, and that part of the lay-population among which the influence of the clergy is predominant? Without this attachment, the *re-adjustments* which improve the harmony of its proportions may yet behold it, not a living, breathing, actuating thing, but simply a more beautiful and shapely corpse. Again, if clergymen see raised over their heads, those who have not, or are imagined not to have, a fixed, abiding, habitual reverence for the Church, as it is, wrought into the texture of their minds; or men either comparatively unknown, or known for qualifications other than theological and ecclesiastical; or men either distinguished but obnoxious, or unobnoxious because undistinguished, Episcopacy itself may be brought into some jeopardy. One despotic bishop, exalted but unacceptable to the clergy, clothed with extraordinary authority, yet not in a position to render that authority beloved, might go far to ruin the whole order, by raising up, not so much a valid argument, as a keen feeling against it. Episcopacy is now a kind, gentle, almost patriarchal rule, which it is felt a glory and a pleasure to obey. Let this rule be exchanged for a harsh, imperious, arbitrary dominion: or this unforced but reverential obedience be exchanged for distrust and dread: make enlarged power simultaneous and side by side with unpopular appointments,—elevate persons, who are regarded with misgiving over others quite equal to them in talents and learning and education, more than equal in experience and judgment,—

“ Older in practice, abler than themselves
To make conditions,—”

and who shall then answer for the consequences, who shall say how soon we must bid adieu to the well being and the stability of the Church of England?

Here, however, as elsewhere, we are determined, while we can to look at the brighter aspect of men and things. Here, as elsewhere, we would repeat that the great fount of mischief is a partial, circumscribed, and, therefore, erroneous view; and that the one great corrective must be a calm comprehensiveness of vision. Our hope is that our theology will go right, provided men can consent to be directed by all that has been given them for a guide, and not attempt to make a clear and consistent scheme of the Gospel by the strange process of leaving out one half of it. Our hope is, that the future ministrations of our clergy will even

excel the past, provided they will embrace the whole compass of religious inquiry, and have respect to all the religious wants of man, both in his individual capacity and his social state. Our hope is, that God will prosper by his blessing what Dr. Wilkins calls the re-adjustment of the Church, provided men will abstain from an exclusive and inordinate devotion to some one favourite principle; but will regard both the basis on which the Church has been founded, and also the habits and exigencies of the present time. But there is, we urgently reiterate, there is one thing more of imperative necessity. We mean a distribution of Church-patronage which shall be without taint and without suspicion. Otherwise the reports of Commissioners may be in vain: the effects of legislation may be vain: the whole paper-and-parchment apparatus of Church-Reform and Church "*renovation*," may be vain. The re-adjusted system cannot be successfully worked by persons in whom the clergy shall have no confidence. But the wheels even of change may proceed with smoothness and ease, if the chief appointments in the establishment shall be filled up with Christian prudence and Christian integrity. There may be danger from without; but Providence may in mercy overrule it into good; and the storms, if they burst, may purify without destroying. There may be a crisis within; but, if the meekness of wisdom be at all infused, even the agitating discussions and the searching controversies of the day may lead to doctrinal truth and practical advantage.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

THEOLOGY.

IN the present, as in previous numbers of this Review, we have taken our stand between Popery and Ultra-Protestantism. For this, we conceive, is the legitimate position of the Church of England. There is neither truth nor safety in any other course. The many excellent and moderate men who compose what is called the Evangelical section of the Church will soon find, if they have not found already, that an extreme position is a false, a perilous, and an untenable position. As yet, we have only been enabled to put forth parts and fragments of the case. The rest of the argument, together with those qualifications and explanations which its nicety and intricacy must in many respects demand, we reserve until we can examine in detail the various works which are poured out upon the controversy; such as "*Dr. Wiseman's Lectures*;" "*The Comparative View of the Tenets of the Anglican and Roman Churches, from the earliest Period, by a Clergyman of the Church of England*;" "*Villers on the Reformation of Luther, abridged by the Rev. W. Marsh*;" and "*The Lectures on Popery, delivered in Glasgow, at the request of the Glasgow Protestant Association*." In the mean time, our readers, we are confident, will feel neither surprise nor apprehension, if we have not fulminated the bolts of wrath or censure with quite so indiscriminate and unmeasured a profusion as others, who have been moved to a perhaps not unnatural warmth, not only by religious considerations, but by the political circumstances of the day, as well as the language held and the attitude assumed by the leaders of the Irish—it is far otherwise with the *English*—papists. The country holds no stauncher friends than ourselves to the Reformation and the true principles of the Reformation; but we know that the cause of Church-of-England Protestantism will be most—nay, can be solely—endangered by a rash, crude, unlettered, unreflecting advocacy.

The matter, we conceive, has very seldom, if ever, been put upon its right grounds. In fact, all these questions require to be discussed in a far more profound, and searching, and dispassionate, and comprehensive spirit than the temper which has usually encountered them. One favourite plan of the day is the scheme of *defending the Church of England* by leaguering the whole of Protestantism in a common crusade against Popery. And the only danger apprehended and sought to be averted, is the rise of a Papal, upon the ruins of the existing, *Establishment*. Yet our own opinions are quite unchanged. If we look to England and Scotland, this peril, we are sure, is entirely and altogether visionary. If we look to *Ireland*, it may be a reasonable fear, that, should the Union between the sister-islands be repealed; should Ireland have again the blessing, or the curse, of a domestic legislature, *then* an attempt may be made to

establish the system of the Papacy as the national Church. The question in that case comes, what conduct, on our part, is likely to accelerate the repeal of the Union? We confidently answer, as we have answered before, every thing that tends to create a kind of *national* antipathy between England and Ireland;—all the truculent harangues, all the exasperating statements, which are as remote from manly statesmanship and fair opposition as light from darkness; and which, in the endeavour to kindle the zeal of Protestants into a blaze, insult, without enfeebling, the adherents of another faith. But, *unless* the Union be repealed, we do *not* fear the national establishment of Popery even in Ireland. On such a question there must be, sooner or later, a complete *division* and *disunion* of the component elements of the majority in the British House of Commons. Here the philosophical revolutionists of England, the Grotes, the Molesworths, the Humes, the Roebucks, the Whittle Harveys, have no sympathy, no real fellow-feeling, with the Irish Priests and their nominees in the Imperial Parliament. Mr. O'Connell perfectly understands this fact; and, therefore, advocates the *voluntary principle in religion*. The actual danger is *there*. Mr. O'Connell is well aware that, in one sense of the word, the most pliant, the most flexible, the most accommodating of all systems is Popery. Mr. O'Connell is right in saying, that it is not *essential* either to the theory or the practice of Popery, that it should be linked in any intimate alliance with the forms of civil authority; and he brings forward the instances of France, and Belgium, and Hungary. In fact, one of the most remarkable phenomena connected with Popery is the Proteus-like slipperiness of its multiform devices amidst all its pretensions to a fixed immutability. Without question, Popery is always ready to put out its *feelers* in quest of secular aggrandisement; to strengthen itself with the *fusces* and all the *insignia* of temporal dominion. Without question, Popery is always ready to ally itself with the state for its own purposes. It would make an instrument and lever of the state. But its glory is, as Mr. O'Connell himself intimates, “*not to be maintained under, but to gain an ascendancy over, the state.*” We, who in the head of the state, recognize also the temporal head of the Church, we, who see Church and State included as to their secular organization under one co-extensive and conterminous authority, we can hardly conceive our English Episcopal system otherwise than as a national Establishment. But the Papacy aspires to be, in its *visible* unity of character, not a *national*, but an *universal* Church. The sovereignty over that Church it would fix in the person of the Pope of Rome; and hence it is, that the argument of “*divided allegiance*” derived in other days its weight and legitimacy. Yet it by no means follows from these premises, that a conscientious Papist may not uphold the voluntary principle, may not deprecate a *State-Church* in any particular kingdom; since the genius of his religion may sometimes acquiesce in being *less* than a state-church, even because it is intent upon being *more*. We might rather regard it *à priori* as a reasonable presumption, even if we had not the special evidence before our eyes, that Roman Catholics would assert and vindicate the voluntary principle under their existing circumstances in the British empire; and if Popery *should* be erected into the dominant, the *state-religion* of Ireland, we venture to prophecy that, without the repeal of the Union, it will be

so erected through the triumph of the voluntary principle in the first instance. What, then, is it but sheer madness, if Churchmen band, and amalgamate, and identify themselves with Dissenters, and act *upon* the voluntary principle and the principle of the equality and fraternization of all Protestant denominations, for the sake of opposing Popery; when their *friends* will turn round upon "*Prelacy, the ape of Popery*," at the very first favourable opportunity, which they can discover or create? What is it but to play the very game of the Papists, if Churchmen rush into a headlong career of blind and frantic vehemence, practically nullifying and stultifying their own system, and trampling Church principles into the dust at every step? But these topics may seem to belong not so much to theology, as to the other head of

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

Here we may almost continue the foregoing train of thought. During this session of parliament, Church questions, as usual, have been in the front of state legislation. His majesty's ministers have urged their Irish Bill with its *appropriation* clauses, even against Lord Stanley's amendments, which certainly were not wanting in the ingredients of Church Reform. What must we say? The time is arrived when every man, if he is honest, must take his side. It is the part but of cowards and traitors to stand aloof. Now, there are three sides which may be taken. It may be contended, either that there ought to be a Protestant Establishment in Ireland; or that there ought to be a Popish Establishment; or that there ought to be no Establishment at all. But our present business is not with the republican theorist, or with the Roman Catholic priest. Yet, compelled as we are by reason and conscience to oppose them; believing that an Ecclesiastical Establishment has been, and is, most beneficial to the British empire; believing, too, that the opinion of the majority in a single quarter of the empire for the time being cannot be the *only* element in determining its character; because, in that case, it would be absurd to talk of the uses of an Establishment, in preserving the purity, the integrity, and the sobriety of faith; compelled, therefore, to oppose them, we can yet understand their arguments, and sympathize with many of their feelings. The sentiments of the speculative Utilitarian, and, still more, perhaps, the sentiments of the Irish Papist, may be honestly, consistently, powerfully supported. But what are we to think of men, who take the premises of one party, and rush to the conclusions of the other? Here we address ourselves to the Ministers of the Crown, and the *Whig* members of the House of Commons. They tell us, that a Protestant Establishment is to be, not subverted in Ireland, but upheld;—they tell us, at least until within this last month they have told us, that they desire to see neither the Establishment demolished altogether, nor a Popish Establishment supplanting the Protestant. This is their avowed, we assume it to be their real, creed; for, otherwise, the hollow insincerity of their professions, or, rather, the indelible infamy of their falsehood, must degrade them into a class of persons with whom we should be sorry to hold any discussion. The question, then, with them, as with us, is not *whether* the Protestant Establishment shall be preserved, but simply *how*? Yet are they fit

to direct the destinies of a mighty kingdom, if they are so shallow as to imagine, or so disingenuous as to pretend, that they can support Protestantism in Ireland by echoing, or, if not echoing, at least not resisting the cry of Messrs. O'Connell and Sheil, about the folly and the wickedness of attempting to maintain a State Religion which is not conformed to the faith of the numerical majority of the population—the majority, that is, of *one* portion of an empire which has not yet been dismembered? Mr. Daniel Whittle Harvey at least puts forward an argument which will hold together; whatever may be the motives for his secession from the ministerial ranks.

These discussions, however, are worn so thread-bare, that we leave them. For, in very truth, projects are agitated again and again, as if to fan the flames of party-spirit, without ever being brought to a conclusion. We see and hear of Irish Church Bills—English Tithe Bills—of which far the best explanation will be found in the elucidatory pamphlet of Professor Jones—Marriage and Registration Bills—Parish Vestry Bills, *cum multis aliis*, hawked and paraded about, until they seem almost like the same wild beasts carried round the country, year after year, in the same caravan, and announced by the showman with the same marvellous descriptions. It is probable that hardly one of these bills will pass the legislature in its present shape; yet the *animus* with which they are concocted, seems to cause disquietude to the ministers and well-wishers of the Church. If *some* of them *should* pass in their present shape, the immediate confusion which they must create is inconceivable; while, in the case of Marriage, the still more serious objection will lie, that, if it is to be a merely civil contract between two human parties, then at the will of those same contracting parties it may soon be dissoluble; but that it is only the solemn intervention of a third party, even the God of the Universe, in whose name the engagement is sealed, and to whom a vow is made and registered in heaven, that can render Marriage that sacred and inviolable rite, which the nature of its institution, and the habits of a Christian country, and the best interests of society, alike demand it to be. We shall not stop to insist upon the pecuniary loss which must be suffered by the Clergy; although it might reasonably be represented as a grievance, that they should be disburdened of their fees on Marriage by one statute, and disencumbered of their fees on Baptism by another, and “relieved” — for *that*, it appears, is the proper and fashionable term — “*relieved*” of their fees on Burial, by a multitude of Cemetery Companies, of which, as we understand, seven new schemes have been lately issued, with a flaming prospectus a-piece.

If the loss sustained by the Clergy could be a gain to all beside, they would cheerfully acquiesce. If the measures proposed had been well digested; and maturely weighed; if they could constitute a panacea for our national maladies; if they could satisfy the Dissenters, and pacify the Roman Catholics; if they could still the waves of religious discord, and introduce a golden perpetuity of harmony, and order, and prosperity, God forbid, that one voice should be lifted up against them. But, alas, quack doctors in other matters, besides civil and ecclesiastical polity, have taught us, long ago, the difference between theory and practice, promise and performance. Otherwise, we should indeed wonder, how

any man, or any woman, in this nineteenth century, could fail to have a luxuriant forest of curling hair, the colour at discretion; and teeth stronger than iron, and whiter than ivory; and a head incapable of aches; and a stomach of imperturbable digestion. We should indeed wonder how any person could consent to a pimple, or a freckle, or a wrinkle, when the clearest, smoothest, most brilliant complexion can be had for half-a-crown; or be weak enough to submit to the encroachments of old age, when all human ailments, and infirmities, and inconveniences can be removed by a box of pills; or be foolish enough to die, when it is so easy to be made immortal by an infallible elixir at thirteen pence halfpenny the bottle. And yet men and women do grow old; and the coffin-maker is as busy as the vender of patent medicines. And so it may be, we fear, in the case of other specifics with which the body politic and ecclesiastic is concerned.

The Sabbath Bill of Sir Andrew Agnew has been again thrown out. With regard to what is called the Sabbath-cause, as with regard to what is called the Temperance-cause, some mischief and much delay, as we apprehend, may arise from the extreme measures of zealous but injudicious reformers. As to the observance of Sunday, let men always bear in mind the distinction, which the Bishop of London and others have drawn between restrictive or coercive legislation on the one hand, and protective legislation on the other. England will now endure little of restrictive, and still less of coercive legislation: but that protective legislation must be secure from cavil, which would guard the conscientious and the religious tradesman from the unfair competition of the rapacious and unscrupulous; and which would afford to all the opportunity and the power of devoting the Lord's day to Christian and holy purposes.

In speaking of the Sabbath, we would just allude to the outcry which has been raised against the determination of the Poor Law Commissioners, that the paupers in the workhouse shall receive religious instruction within its walls: but shall not be allowed to attend divine service in the parish church. Their argument is forcible and well put: yet, as this may be regarded as a matter not merely of reason, but of feeling, we do hope that the decision will be reconsidered. It does look like a painful hardship, that, while all others may go up to the House of God *as friends*, the poorest should be cut off from the privilege and the blessing of public and united worship in company with their fellow creatures. There are some two or three features in the new system which we have never been able to approve, however ruinous might be the evils of the old: but we have earnestly desired that it should have a smooth and favourable trial: and we have particularly rejoiced at that general and almost unprecedented demand for labour, which may well be reckoned providential at the crisis of its introduction. Deep, therefore, would be our regret, that any odium should be attached to it on religious grounds. The Poor Law Commissioners deserve the thanks of the country, as on other accounts, so for their late printed explanation and recommendation of the institution of SICK CLUBS:—an insurance against sickness being one essential ingredient in the formation of provident habits.

Some communications, we may here say, have reached us respecting the plans of a Church report, and also, if it be practicable, a synoptical view of Eccle-

siastical Literature:—the work, whatever its scale, to be, of course, confined to a statement of facts as distinguished from opinions. We are perfectly assured that good statistics must be the only basis either of sound legislation, or of any individual judgment which is worth a farthing: but we have here neither time nor space to speak in detail. Let us just throw out the suggestion, that a *Church report*, perhaps, might be accomplished on that *mutual principle*, which is merely a new shape of the principle of association or combination, and on which even daily newspapers are to be set on foot. We mean that a certain number of persons, say 2,000 or 3,000, should each subscribe a small sum in the first instance, say ten shillings,—or else should make themselves jointly responsible for the expense of one number of the work; should appoint a committee, or an editor to conduct it; should sell the copies at an appointed price to non-subscribers; while themselves should either have their copy *gratis*, if they had originally subscribed; or at a price, which should be found proper, and, if the thing succeeded, would be most extremely cheap, after the expenses of publication had been deducted. The plan would, of course, require much care in its actual development: but it seems calculated for works, which could not involve difference of sentiments, but would be exclusively confined to the collection and distribution of positive information. As to its *general* application to *cheap literature*, there may be strong doubts: but the matter will be well worthy of consideration, when we come, as we hope soon to come, to a broad inquiry into the means of “*social improvement in connection with the Church.*” On this most interesting and animating question we are now collecting materials: and for any authentic accounts of intellectual movements, and philanthropic projects, friendly in their spirit to the religion of the land, we shall be peculiarly thankful.

All human amelioration, it is our solemn belief, must be bound up with that divine system which alone can explain man's nature, or correct it; which holds out the mirror of his degradation and corruption, and at the same time develops his noblest capacities, and carries him onward towards the highest perfection of his being.

Our whole inquiry, then, would proceed upon the principles that the Clergy of civilized lands must be the chief instruments in all social improvement; and that the whole problem of human happiness must depend upon the solution of the previous questions;

1. What is the best and purest form of Christianity?

2. By what machinery and what constitution of things can the work of Christianization be best performed; so that the letter and the spirit, the doctrine and the practice, of the Gospel shall be diffused throughout a community, and ultimately throughout the habitable globe?

3. How these two elements, the purest forms of Christianity, and the best machinery for diffusing it, ought to be connected with all other means and processes of human improvement?

Many collateral problems are also involved; as, for instance, how far these

questions are of universal solution, and how far they admit of modifications, as being variable with local and temporary circumstances.

RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

The platform season has just closed. The interval has arrived, during which the actors separate, and the system of Christian *agitation*,—we would use the word in a good and not an offensive sense,—is hushed and lulled. Far be it from us to denounce this system altogether; seeing, as we must see, how vast an impetus is communicated by it to pious benevolence; and feeling, as we must feel, how necessary it may be in this imperfect world, to put to some spiritual interest that love of excitement which scrupulous persons could not gratify so well in any other way, that love of celebrity which is so powerful an incentive to action in many minds; to take advantage, in fact, of human nature as it is, to turn even its vanities to account, and make its very weakness conduce to the spread of virtue and religion. Yet, while we quite abstain from any sweeping condemnation in the gross, while we must acknowledge that Associations, and speeches, and public meetings, have their potency, and very often their use, we cannot think that all the elements and all the details of the system will be found ultimately subservient to the cause of social improvement; that is, if social improvement is connected with the integrity of the Church.

There is before us a Statement, printed for the use of persons of decided piety, which contains a list of no less than *sixty-six* "*Public Meetings*" which were to take place from the 27th April to 14th June, both inclusive, in the year 1836. It specifies, in parallel columns, the name of the society, the occasion, the *place* of meeting, the *day*, the *hour*, and the *preacher* or *chairman*; and it is really a very curious document, of which, with some other more valuable papers, we hope hereafter to make use. There appear to be some omissions from inadvertence; but, of course, we could not feel surprise that such poor and insignificant societies as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and the National Society for the Education of the Poor, were left out of a catalogue which could only find room for the *Wesleyan Missionary Society*, the *Christian Instruction Society*, the *British Reformation Society*, the *City Mission Society*, the *Established Church Society*, the *Church Pastoral Aid Society*, the *Protestant Association*, and the like. We must say, however, that it is some proof of the *buoyancy* of the Establishment, to find the "*Episcopal Floating Church*" among the number.

But let us say, in serious earnest, that there are many *foreign* objects for which Associations are absolutely required; there are some home objects for which Associations are most desirable; but still, as we have already hinted more than once, there are certain rules, which must be binding at least upon Churchmen: certain axioms of which *they* at least will hardly deny the truth or the importance. Three only of such canons would we now venture to lay down, and they are

truisms so self-evident, that we should have been ashamed to have enunciated them, if we had not seen them so often, in practice, forgotten, or overlooked, or even outraged.

1. Fresh associations are not to be encouraged by Churchmen, where they are likely materially to interfere, and even clash in a kind of hostile collision, with organized Church societies already established and working well.

2. Societies are not to be encouraged by Churchmen, where they have for their bond of union any principle at variance with the theory or practice of a national Church, as distinguished from the multitude of independent sects.

And 3. Societies are not to be encouraged by Churchmen where they infringe upon the authority which the Church exercises through her prelates; or disturb the regular local or parochial action which she exercises through her ordained pastors and ministers.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

From the throng before us we can now only select two publications:—the first being the collected "*Works of Dr. Chalmers*," carefully revised by himself and published by William Collins at Glasgow, of which two volumes have reached us, containing and concluding the treatise on Natural Theology. An elaborate criticism would here be out of place; because we have already reviewed the main substance of the present production—although it is now much enlarged and in some parts quite remodelled,—when it appeared as one of the Bridgwater Treatises: and because a more fit opportunity will offer itself hereafter for giving a general survey of the genius and the labours of Dr. Chalmers. Yet we cannot refrain from saying that this essay is an almost exhaustless mine of intellectual wealth: and we doubt not that many and many a young author will dive into its treasures and spread some of its precious ore over the surface of his own pages. The prominent excellencies are a vast fecundity of thought; a glowing richness of diction; a moral tone lofty, noble, impassioned and animating: a copiousness which leaves nothing unexamined and unexplained; a searching spirit of an analysis, and yet a glorious power of combination. The faults are, for this admirable writer is not without his faults, the iteration of the same conceptions under different, and sometimes *scarcely* different aspects, until their repetition almost wearies and confuses the mind; the redundancies of a style too diffusive, too gorgeous, too metaphorical, for the austere and simple chasteness of philosophy; the introduction of some topics, which disturb the unity of design, and which, if not altogether unconnected with natural theology have yet no more peculiar relevancy than a crowd of kindred topics in ethical, or political, or economical science; the occasional display of rhetorical mannerism; and the use of a few neologisms in expression, which sound strangely and harshly at least in English ears. This enumeration may be ungracious, where use and beauty have so entire a preponderance over defects: but we have made it, because a literature is never corrupted by little men; whereas the faults of great writers are sure to be imitated by their successors.

and exaggerated by those who never reach or even appreciate, their excellencies.

The other work of great value and importance, to which we have alluded, is the New Edition of Cowper's Works, with the "Life" by the Poet Laureat; published by Messrs. Baldwin & Cradock. Four volumes have already come out in a type such as it is a pleasure to look upon: all enriched with new matter of the highest interest; and full of beautiful embellishments, intellectual as well as pictorial. The delineation of the strength and the weakness, the piety, and, alas, the madness of the unhappy Cowper, is as forcible and impressive, as remarkable for pathetic truth and unaffected vigour, as any thing which it has ever been our fortune to read. No lesson can be more admonitory either to the philosopher or to the Christian. Yet it is almost awful to see the curtain drawn away from before the struggles and the terrors of such a mind. It were idle to quote from a work, which is in every body's hands. Nor can it be needful to say, that, in point of style, Southey's Memoir is quite worthy to introduce Cowper's Letters. Both are unrivalled and inimitable in their way. Southey stands foremost among the biographers with as unquestioned a pre-eminence as Cowper among the epistolary writers of our land and language.

For the rest, in speaking of the works of which we might have been anxious to present some account to our readers, we must begin with mentioning that the long forthcoming Bridgwater Treatise of Dr. Buckland has not yet been published. The delay, we believe, has arisen from the careful labour which has been bestowed; more especially from the number and novelty of the illustrations, and the very few persons in London who are competent to their mechanical and typographical execution. We have been allowed some opportunities of forming a judgment; but it might not be deemed fair either to author or publisher to give another explanatory review before the appearance of the production itself. At the same time, it is but just to ourselves to state our reasons for not yet doing what we have more than once promised to do.

The want of space must be an excuse for now omitting an analysis of other publications; reviews of some of which have been already either completed or in preparation. We may specify "*The Physical Theory of Another Life*;" Gilbert's "*Lectures on the Atonement*;" and the work of Dr. Whitley on the same subject, intitled "*The Doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice*;" "*The Religion of the Universe, by Dr. Fellowes*;" and "*The Abridgement of Jeremy Taylor on Prayer*," by the Rev. W. H. Hale. Among productions which may be styled controversial, we beg to recommend, on many accounts, "*The Scriptural Vindication of Church Establishments*," by the Rev. George Holden; and there are many volumes of general importance, which we can now only announce, although to some of them at least we shall recur hereafter;—as, for instance, "*The Remains of Knox*," and "*The Life of Bishop Jebb*;" "*The Christian Theology of John Howe*;" "*The Edition of Paley's Natural Theology*," with notes by Lord Brougham and Sir Charles Bell; Mr. Irons "*On Final Causes*;" "*A Dissertation on Philosophy and Theology*," by Daniel Chapman; the miscellaneous works of Dr. Clarke, "*Faber on Primitive Election*," "*Calvinism*

scripturally examined and refuted," by William Houghton; and "*The History of Episcopacy in the United States, beginning with Virginia*," by Dr. Hawke. Perhaps the most interesting Biography before us is "*The Memoirs of Dr. Carey*;" and from books of travels we cannot but single out "*The Journey to Mount Sinai and Petra*," by M. Léon de Laborde. Of this great work a very cheap and useful English edition, with quite a multitude of illustrations, has been published by Mr. Murray, who deserves our thanks for presenting, in an accessible form, a publication which must be of extreme value and interest to every Christian reader, and which affords fresh proofs, how the face of the globe bears testimony to the truths of the Bible. The account of China, in the Edinburgh Cabinet Library, is also most worthy of perusal both on religious and general grounds. Nor can we help mentioning that altogether beautiful book, as classical in style as in subject, breathing throughout the spirit of elegant taste and varied scholarship, "*Athens and Attica: Journal of a Residence there*," by the Rev. C. Wordsworth, Head Master of Harrow School. Of Sermons—one by the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, we see announced—we can only allude to the recent labours of the excellent and indefatigable Mr. Girdlestone; to the *Sermons on Association*, by the Rev. G. A. Poole; and to the Lent Lectures of the Rev. R. C. Coxe, intitled "*Death disarmed of his Terrors*." The pamphlets of the day are too many even for enumeration. Their prevailing tone, however, with regard to Church matters is, we must say, either apprehensive complaint or indignant remonstrance. One *brochure* is called "*The Church in Danger*, an Address to the Members of the Established Church," and the anonymous author writes on the fly-leaf to inform us, "This pamphlet is intended to show that an apostacy of the National Church must be the inevitable consequence sooner or later of the present system of Church Patronage, founded as it is on the statute 25 Hen. VIII.; and, therefore, that we ought to petition against it—see page 21; and *if that petition be disregarded, then to take measures for the preservation of our faith among ourselves*."

We looked, accordingly, at p. 21, and there we found the *measures* proposed to be, that we should separate the Church from the State altogether; or, if we fail in doing this, *separate ourselves* from the Church, and form a new communion." Such things as these, and the similar outbreaks already exhibited, sometimes cause us to feel, that only divine Providence can save the Church amidst the insidiousness of its enemies, and the wild panic-stricken imprudence of its friends. Yet even these things may, at least, indicate the fever of uneasiness which is now burning in many bosoms, and our statesmen will do well not wantonly to disregard them.—Mr. Fielden's Pamphlet, the *Cause of the Factory System*, may afford matter for future discussion.

Mr. Place, and the Rev. Mr. Owen, two apostles of Irvingism, have been calling, we believe, on almost all the clergymen in the metropolis, and favouring them, like ourselves, with a long rhapsody of a pamphlet, in the shape of an appeal to the Archbishops, Bishops, and Ministers of the Church, in support of their delusions. Would that we could sometimes take a lesson from the activity of enthusiasm. In other respects these gentlemen can hardly be thought fit

models for imitation; though Mr. Owen, at least, as having been a Clergyman of the Establishment, really calls for our intense compassion. They too, we perceive, affect a prodigious attachment to Episcopal authority, and to the Church of England, even while they are building Chapels in opposition to both as fast as they can find means. The whole system of these unhappy Irvingites is to our minds only another demonstration that religion, when no longer submitted to the fair exercise of the understanding, when once unmoored from reason, must and will drift about on a tumbling sea of fanaticism and folly.

The Illustrative Works seem to realize the poet's description of Cleopatra; they are still full of beauty and freshness; nor can even "custom stale their infinite variety."

CONTENTS

OF

Nº. XL.

PAGE.

- ART. I. Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America. By Francis L. Hawks, Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New York. Vol. I. 261
- II. Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology. By Rev. William Buckland, D.D., Canon of Christ Church and Reader in Geology and Mineralogy in the University of Oxford 295
- III. A History of the English Episcopacy; from the period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity; with Notices of the Religious Parties of the Time, and a Review of Ecclesiastical Affairs in England, from the Reformation. By the Rev. Thomas Lathbury, M.A. 329
- IV. The Divine Glory Manifested in the Conduct and Discourses of our Lord. Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1836, at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury. By Charles A. Ogilvie, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and late Fellow of Balliol College 350
- V. An Elementary Course of Theological Lectures, in Three Parts. Delivered in Bristol College. By the Rev. W. D. Conybeare, M.A. F.R.S., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, &c. &c., Visitor of the College 363

	PAGE.
ART. VI. Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church. By Nicholas Wiseman, D. D. . . .	373
VII. Physical Theory of another Life. By the Author of Natural History of Enthusiasm	403
VIII. 1. A Selection of Psalms and Hymns, from various Authors, intended chiefly for Public Worship.	
2. Psalms and Hymns, selected and adapted to the purposes of Public Worship: By the Rev. Edward Scobell, A. M.	
3. Church and Home Melodies ; being a New Version of the more devotional parts of the Psalms ; together with a Version of the Collects, and Original Hymns for Congregational and Domestic Purposes. By the Rev. Thomas James Judkin, M. A.	417
IX. The Roman Schism illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church. By the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B. C. L.	426
X. Journey through Arabia Petræa to Mount Sinai and the Excavated City of Petra, the Edom of the Prophecies. By M. Léon de Laborde	446
XI. Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Dublin and Glandelagh, at the Visitation in 1836. To which is added an Address to the Clergy on the close of the Confirmation held at the same time. By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin	475
<hr style="width: 20%; margin: 20px auto;"/>	
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD	484

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

OCTOBER, 1836.

ART. I.—*Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America.* By Francis L. Hawks, Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New-York. Vol. I. New-York. 1836.

THIS modest and unpretending volume is full of interest and instruction. We cordially recommend it to the perusal of all classes; more especially of those who look on the troubles and dangers of our own Church with an eye of faith and hope, *coupled with fear*. The history of the Episcopalian Communion in America is very much less known and studied in this country, than it deserves. We would gladly see that Communion in possession of a high and honourable place in our thoughts. It would amply repay the closest attention that could be bestowed upon the story of its vicissitudes. Its adversity, and its prosperity, are equally rich in lessons for our admonition. And,—if there be any, whom nothing but *successful* exertion can awaken to sympathy,—to them it may be interesting to learn, that the hour of adversity would seem to have well nigh passed away from it, and that its prosperity is now shining, more and more, unto the perfect day. Even they who look, with no benignant mind, upon the fortunes of Episcopacy, either in this country, or in the West, may consult this volume, without the smallest danger to their equanimity. For, it is pervaded, throughout, by an admirable spirit of candour and of moderation. The writer, indeed, will always be found faithful and true-hearted to the Church of his Fathers. But, even so, he is never inflamed to rancorous and vindictive emotion, by the memory of those deep injuries, which, from time to time, were heaped upon her, by the hatred of her adversaries. It seems never to be absent from his mind, that the perils of ease and success are at least as formidable, as those of the most fiery course of trial: and his work actually concludes

with the salutary caution, that "abused prosperity is apt to find its corrective, sooner or later, in the purifying touch of persecution."

We learn from the author that a more comprehensive work than the one now immediately before us, was originally in his contemplation. His first purpose was to collect such fragments of the history of the whole Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, as had escaped the ravages of time, and to form them into a volume, or two, of Annals, properly so called,—a sort of Chronological Repertory of the leading events. But the loss of a valued friend, the Reverend Edward Rutledge, who was to have been his fellow-labourer, suspended this design; and compelled the author to content himself, at least for the present, with the Ecclesiastical History of a single State. Virginia was selected by him as the first field of his researches, as being the oldest State in the Transatlantic Union. In the execution of this purpose, he has been induced to depart from the character of a mere annalist, and to venture upon a wider range of historical narration. The gradual accumulation of materials has, further, suggested the design of a series of volumes, upon a similar plan, one for each of the older dioceses. We have heard, with great satisfaction, that his labours, hitherto, have met with generous acceptance among his own countrymen. A large impression of the volume, now before us, has been rapidly absorbed by their wise and laudable curiosity: and the very first of his engagements will, now, be to prepare a new edition. It is still more gratifying to learn, that the Episcopal Church of the United States has held out the most animating encouragement to the prosecution of the whole of that noble task which he has proposed to himself. It appears from the Journal of the General Convention held in 1835, (p. 100,) that the venerable Bishop White, and the Reverend Dr. Hawks, were requested to apply, in the name of the Convention, to such persons or societies in England, as might be in possession of documents illustrative of the history of the American Church, and to solicit the use of such documents, or copies of them, for the benefit of that Church: and, of all such materials, Dr. Hawks has been appointed the conservator. In pursuance of this commission he has recently visited England, as the agent and trustee of the General Convention. All this is just as it should be. It shows the honourable solicitude of our Episcopalian brethren to secure a perfectly authentic compilation of materials for the history of their communion. It is almost needless to add that Dr. Hawks found the Archives of Lambeth and of Fulham, and those of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, most liberally open to him. His researches in those depositories have

been amply rewarded by a vast mass of important papers; which, together with the collections previously made by him in his own country, will furnish most interesting and valuable illustration to the Annals of the Church of the United States; more especially during the last century. We do earnestly hope and trust that his joy at these results will be fulfilled by the cordial sympathy and support of his brother Episcopalians in England. In the mean time, it shall be our endeavour to animate their curiosity by a brief and rapid sketch of his history of the Church of Virginia; and to distil from his narrative some portion at least of the salutary essence, which it will be found most abundantly to contain.

The earliest ecclesiastical history of Virginia is illustrated by one venerable and honoured name. Among the petitioners for the charter granted by James I., in April 1606, was the Reverend Robert Hunt; and it would appear that the whole enterprise was preserved from disastrous failure chiefly by the power of Christian meekness and patience, exemplified in the person of this admirable man. He was prompted to join the expedition, not by the hopes of winning a *golden fleece*, but by a motive which, in those days, the pioneers of civilization were seldom ashamed to profess. One of the avowed objects, expressed in his Majesty's instructions to the Company, was, that "the true word and service of God be preached, planted, and used, not only in the colonies, but also, as much as might be, among the savages bordering upon them; and this, according to the rites and doctrines of the Church of England." To the accomplishment of this purpose, Robert Hunt may be said to have dedicated his life. His first object, on the foundation of the infant settlement, was the erection of a Church; but in a few months after its completion, the humble edifice was destroyed by an accidental fire, which desolated the whole village, and, among other property, consumed the library of its pastor. The servant of God, however, was never heard to utter a syllable of despondency or complaint. He imparted his own resigned and cheerful spirit to the heart-stricken colonists; and, being aided by the persevering energy of Captain Smith, the true father of Virginia, he found the reward of his labours, in the re-construction of the town, and in the restoration of the Church. Another of his achievements bears a no less honourable testimony to his piety and wisdom. Like many other infant establishments, Virginia was in danger of being torn to pieces by the discords of its angry rulers. But it was the glory of Hunt to reconcile dissensions, which, otherwise, might have brought ruin upon the colony; and this, without being claimed as a partisan by either faction. And thus it was that he earned, in a distinguished measure, the beatitude of the peace-makers.

The further details of his history are but scantily known. Enough, however, has been preserved to satisfy us, that Providence could scarcely have bestowed a more signal blessing on the band of exiles, than the presence of this exemplary minister of the Gospel.

The next remarkable circumstance, in the history of the settlement, was, the introduction of a body of laws, for its government. In these enactments, the Church was not forgotten: and, in one respect at least, they appear to have distinctly recognized its *militant* condition: for, the whole body of Ecclesiastical Canons was conceived in a truly *martial* spirit of severity. Neglect of public worship was punishable by *martial* law. *Death* was the penalty prescribed for contemptuous words against the known articles of the Christian faith. A profane swearer was to have a bodkin run through his tongue, for the second offence; and, for the third, he was to "be brought to a *court-martial*, there to receive censure of *death*." They who should behave disrespectfully to their ministers, were to be publicly whipped three times; and to ask forgiveness in the Congregation, on three Sabbath days. Absentees from daily service were to lose their day's allowance for the first offence; to be whipped for the second; and, for the third, to be condemned to the galleys for six months. Attendance on the Sabbath-worship was enforced with a rigour still more formidable. For his first fault, the offender was to lose his provision and allowance for the week following; for the second, he was not only to lose his allowance, but to be publicly whipped; and, for the third, he was to suffer the penalty of *death*. Lastly, all those ignorant persons, who should refuse to resort to their minister for religious instruction, were to be once whipped for the first act of recusancy; to be twice whipped for the second; and, if they still remained obstinate, they were to be whipped *every day*, until they should acknowledge their fault, and publicly ask forgiveness in the Congregation. From all which it is manifest, that the early legislators of Virginia had yet to learn, that the scourge and the halter are but sorry teachers of religion, and that Christ has no more concord with Draco, than he has with Belial or Moloch. And, melancholy it is to think, that this lesson was, in that age, almost equally unknown to every religious denomination in Christendom. Fortunately, however, for the colonists, the magistrates were better than the laws. The code was far too merciless to be enforced: and it now stands before us purely as a monument of human infatuation.

That which the beadle and the hangman must have failed to effect, might have been attempted with better hope, if the mother-country had given timely attention to the cry for help which was raised by Alexander Whitaker, known by the honourable title of

the Apostle of Virginia. Like Robert Hunt, this faithful man was consumed by his zeal for the honour of God's House. He, accordingly, lifted up his voice in passionate expostulation against the spiritual apathy of his brethren at home:—"I muse," he exclaims in one of his Epistles, "that so few of our English ministers, that were so hot against surplice and subscription, come hither, where neither are spoken of. Do they not either wilfully hide their talents; or keep themselves at home, for fear of losing a few pleasures? Be there not any amongst them of Moses his mind, and of the Apostles, that forsook all to follow Christ? But I refer them to the Judge of all hearts, that shall reward every one, according to the gain of his talent." The appeal was echoed by the Council of Virginia, in language which might well become the most devoted missionary, and which entitles them to be held in everlasting remembrance, as truly Christian statesmen. In the mean time, the Martial Code was suffered to sleep quietly, till an attempt was made to awaken it into action by an oppressive and rapacious officer, one Captain Argall; who, in May 1617, arrived from England, invested with the authority of Deputy Governor. In 1618, he ventured to promulgate that "every person should go to Church, Sundays and holydays, or lie *neck and heels* all that night, and be a slave to the colony the following week; for the second offence, should be a slave for a month; and, for the third, a year and a day." This stupid eruption of tyranny raised a burst of indignation among the colonists; and led, eventually, to the disuse of Ecclesiastico-Military discipline.

The year 1619 is memorable for the establishment of a Virginian Legislature, chosen from among the inhabitants. The Church was among the first objects of its labours. Being utterly blind to the wisdom of the *Voluntary System*, they enacted that each Clergyman should receive annually from his parishioners, 1500 pounds of tobacco, and sixteen barrels of corn. And, if this levy should not prove equal in value to 200*l.*, (a sum probably equivalent to 500*l.* or 600*l.* of our present money), the minister was to be content with less. Here, one principle of an Establishment was most distinctly recognized and enforced, although the number of Clergymen in the Colony did not exceed five. Further means were resorted to for the encouragement of emigrant ministers from England; a purpose to which the Bishop of London gave his sanction and his assistance. And from this period is usually dated the jurisdiction of that Prelate over the Colonial Church. The plans which followed, for the advancement of the Colony in spiritual knowledge and mental accomplishment, were unhappily defeated for a time, by the horrible massacre of Opecanough; an atrocity which had been in

preparation for no less than four years previously to its bursting forth; and which exhibited in a fearful light the perfidious and patient cunning of the native Indian. From the conversion of the Princess Pocahontas, and her marriage with Mr. Rolfe in 1611, the settlers had been disarmed of all suspicion, and of all caution, by the quiet, friendly, and pacific demeanour of their savage neighbours. "Sooner shall the sky fall,"—said the wily Chief,—“than the peace shall be violated on my part.” All this while, thirty different tribes had been maturing a murderous conspiracy for the extirpation of the foreigners. On the 22nd of March, 1622, the scheme of destruction was in readiness. Hordes of merciless barbarians carried simultaneous and indiscriminate slaughter into thirty-one settlements: and all thoughts of the College of Henrico, (which had for some time been projected), were lost by the survivors in purposes of revenge. The only place which was found in a posture of defence was James Town; and this was indebted for its preservation to the fidelity of a converted Indian, by the name of *Chanco*. The brother of this man had communicated to him the bloody design, on the night previous to its execution; together with a command from his Chief Opecanough, that he should murder his master, Richard Pace. The grateful Indian imparted the dreadful secret to Pace, in whom he had always found a benefactor and friend. And by this accident alone was the colony delivered from total destruction.

In 1624, the colony was beginning to recover from this awful blow. The ordinances relative to the Church, passed by the Assembly of that year, attest, not by any means an abandonment of the original and arbitrary principles of Church government, but a considerable mitigation of their practical severity. The whip and the gibbet were no longer resorted to, as instruments for the promotion of piety. Discipline now addressed itself chiefly to the pocket of the offender. A pound of tobacco was the penalty to be incurred for absence from divine service for one Sunday; and fifty pounds for obstinate perseverance in neglect for the space of a month. Disrespect to the Clergy was punishable by a payment of 500 pounds of the same current commodity. No one was allowed to dispose of his tobacco until the minister was satisfied, on pain of double forfeiture. And one man was appointed in every plantation, to collect the minister's salary, out of the best of the tobacco and grain to be found in it. This substitution of pecuniary loss for savage personal infliction, was, at least, a promising symptom. It showed that the fever of Ecclesiastical domination was beginning to abate. But, still, it is quite evident, that the day-spring of the *Voluntary System* had not, as yet, dawned upon the land. On the contrary,—in that quarter,

the thickest darkness was brooding heavily over it, and shutting out the light of true liberality and wisdom. For—will it be believed?—the next step of legislation was the institution of *tithes*! Yes—it positively was ordained that all who work in the ground, “of what quality soever they be, shall pay tithes to the ministers.” This *dark* enactment was passed at some time between 1624 and 1628. But this was not the worst. It appears that, at this period, the authority of the Church of England was almost without disturbance or rivalry; and that, by the year 1642, the decrees of the English Court of High Commission were fully acknowledged in the Ecclesiastical concerns of Virginia. It was felt that the genius of Laud was as predominant there, as it was in Britain. Puritans there were none throughout the colony. Nevertheless, it was thought needful that laws should be enacted against the Puritans, in order to preserve the country from the possible infection of their influence and their doctrine. The supposed absurdity, or tyranny, of these provisions, unfortunately betrayed a man by the name of Reek, into a perilous eruption of spleen, or jocularly. He ventured to observe that “his Majesty was at *confession* with my Lord of Canterbury,” The humorist paid dearly for the wantonness of his tongue. He was pilloried for two hours, with a label on his back describing his delinquency; he was fined to the amount of 50*l.*; and sentenced to imprisonment during pleasure. And it is remarkable enough, that this ungracious event was speedily followed by an application from Virginia, addressed to the General Court of Massachusetts, and to the gentlemen of influence in the community, beseeching them “to send ministers of the Gospel into that region, that its inhabitants might be privileged with the preaching and ordinances of Jesus Christ.”

“The lesson” says Dr. Hawks, “is plain and impressive. Up to the period of Hervey’s arrival, in 1629, there was no complaint; the colonists were content to remain in the bosom of that Church in which they had been reared; and there is ample evidence of a conscientious and general attachment to the faith which was established. The colony of Massachusetts Bay was planted by men who, for the most part, were decided in their opposition to the Church of England. That Church received as little countenance among them, as puritanism found in Virginia: and yet, notwithstanding this marked difference of opinion, a portion of the Church in Virginia is found, goaded into madness by the folly of rulers, and willing to manifest its resentment by an alliance with those who could furnish no aid, but at the expense of that Church which once had their best affections.”—p. 52.

We do not find that the call for help, on the part of the Virginians, was answered with any remarkable alacrity by New

England. Three Congregational Missionaries were, at length, despatched. But the legislature of Virginia were prompt in providing for their reception. The ministers of Boston were soon stared in the face by a peremptory enactment, that none but Clergymen Episcopally ordained should be allowed to officiate in the colony; and that they, who should produce testimonials of ordination by some Bishop in England, should further be required to subscribe the orders and constitutions of the Church of England, and the laws there established. All who might presume to teach or preach publicly, in contravention of this act, were to be suspended and silenced by the Governor and Council; and, in case of obstinate persistence, were to be removed from the colony by the first convenience. By these enactments, the incursion of schism was, for a time, repelled. We learn, however, from Mather, that although the Missionaries of Independence had little encouragement from the rulers, they had a kind entertainment from the people: and, from Winthrop, that, though the State did silence the Ministers, because they would not conform to the order of England, yet the people resorted to them, in private houses, to hear them. So that, from this time we may reasonably date the first scattering of the seeds of non-conformity upon the soil of Virginia.

Throughout the revolutionary struggle in the mother country, Virginia preserved her name for loyalty unsullied. She was the last to surrender to the forces of the Parliament; and the honorable terms on which her submission was accepted, sufficiently attest the spirit and intelligence of her people. The oppressive influence of the Protectorate was unable to stifle her fidelity to the cause of her monarch and her Church. She was always regarded with suspicion and dislike by the Usurper; but he was nevertheless fain to content himself with rebuking her "presumption and impiety." It would occupy too much of our space, to trace the history of this settlement for the half century which followed the Restoration. We must pass onward to the year 1722. And here, the prospect disclosed to us, it must be confessed, is sufficiently humiliating. For an exposition of the spiritual condition of the country, at that period, we cannot do better than resort to the statements of her present historian:—

"One hundred and fifteen years had now elapsed since the first Clergyman landed in Virginia, and yet candour calls for the acknowledgment that the state of religion was much lower than in some of the other colonies. It was not that the government had been entirely indifferent to their undertaking to make provision for its support: to outward appearance the condition of the Church seemed prosperous enough. The traveller, in his journeyings through the colony, might see on every

band the neat spire of a substantial Church lifting its head amid the foliage of the forest in which it was placed ; his eye rested on the cultivated grounds which surrounded the comfortable habitations of the Clergy ; and he might from these tokens have hastily concluded that he was in the bosom of a deeply pious population : yet was there, in very many, a lamentable want of the practical fruits of godliness. There was a deficiency of spirituality in the religion of that day. The ' form of sound words ' which imbodyed devotion, most useful as an auxiliary in the united worship of a congregation, and beautifully chaste and simple in the ritual of the Church to which the colonists belonged, was scrupulously observed ; but in the use of that form alone, too many, it is to be feared, rested : such use was substituted for the power of godliness in renewing a sinful nature ; for the operation of the Holy Ghost upon an unsanctified heart. It would be unjust to include all in this sentence. There is evidence that some, both of Clergy and laity, were deeply imbued with the spirit of genuine piety ; they were worthy and consistent Christians ; but they certainly did not form the most numerous class of the population."—pp. 86, 87.

Having thus faithfully and candidly exhibited the state of religion in this stronghold of monarchy and episcopacy, the author proceeds to a consideration of the various causes, which appear to have conspired towards the production of this most unsatisfactory result. We earnestly solicit the attention of our countrymen to the leading particulars of his disquisition. They will be found to supply the present generation with certain valuable lessons, which they may perhaps disregard, but which it will be impossible for them to reject with impunity.

In the first place, then, it appears that the condition of the clergy was, in some essential respects, deplorably adverse to their independence, and, consequently, to their usefulness. The usual mode of obtaining a living was this: A clergyman, who might be desirous of a location in Virginia, signified his wish to the Bishop of London; from whom, if approved, he obtained a license and certificate, together with an order on the treasury for the sum of 20*l.*, to defray the expenses of his voyage. On his arrival, he applied to the governor, or to the parishioners of some vacant living, and, sometimes, to both; and, if his ministrations were agreeable to the congregation, he was *received* as their minister. He was *received*; but, it was much in the same sense, in which a man *receives* a valet, or a butler, or a coachman, into his service. His *reception* conferred no permanent settlement; for, by an act passed in 1642, it had been provided, that the governor should make *induction* of a clergyman into any parish to which the clergyman had been *presented* by that parish. But then, it was left entirely at the option of the parish, to make, or to withhold, such *presentation*! Without *induction*, the minister was destitute of any freehold interest in his living. Inducted he

could not be, unless it should be the pleasure of the parish to present him to the governor. And, as it was very rarely indeed the pleasure of the vestries to present, the spiritual pastor became, for the most part, in effect, the *hired* servant of his congregation,—*hired* from year to year!

It was not to be imagined that men of sterling worth would be induced to quit their country, for the purpose of occupying a position of such abject servility and degradation, in a foreign land. Nay, it was scarcely to be expected that even the prospect of a perfectly independent and honourable maintenance, would secure a sufficient and perpetual influx of able ministers from England. The thing manifestly needed by the colony was, not only an independent clergy, but a *native* clergy. And the want of this indispensable supply was fatal, for a season, to the spiritual health of the settlement. The persons actually sent out by the mother country were, in general, a set of needy clerical adventurers; poor in capacity, and poorer still in that becoming elevation of sentiment and principle, which alone can command the veneration and attachment of the people. The result was precisely what might have been anticipated. The Church bore too much resemblance to a whited sepulchre. It was fair and comely enough, in its external aspect. But, instead of being all glorious within, it was filled with impurity and decay.

Another cause of confusion and degeneracy, was the want of a resident Bishop in the colony. The Bishop of London was the only Bishop of Virginia; and, of course, episcopal discipline was palsy-smitten. A commissary indeed there was in the settlement. But, for all the most important purposes of discipline, the commissary was an utterly powerless representative of the diocesan. He had no authority to degrade, or to remove, or even to suspend, a slothful or profligate minister. The most worthless incumbent might set him at defiance. The incumbent, had, in fact, no bishop to fear, but that many-headed prelate, his own congregation. His doctrines might be sapless, and his life scandalously self-indulgent. But, if the people *loved to have it so*,—if they preferred a supple and vicious slave to a faithful reprover of their evil doings,—the parish beadle was about as competent to redress the mischief, as the delegate of a bishop on the other side of the Atlantic.

Nothing can well be more melancholy than the picture, which is laid before us, of the consequences resulting from the operation of the Voluntary Scheme, aggravated as it was by the absence of all effective episcopal control. The oppressed and degraded clergy were constantly presenting to the people, in their own walk and conversation, a base and mutilated image of Christianity. The people, on the other hand, in their sordid lust of

power, were labouring to make their pastors *yet more vile*. And thus, by a pernicious and incessant re-action between these two classes, a ruinous force was accumulating, which threatened the very life of all "true Religion and Virtue." It happened, in many instances, that the power of removing their ministers was exercised by the congregation, really with something like a *consistent*, though perverse, regard to the moral *excellence* of the man. He had only to lift up a faithful testimony against the wickedness of the people, and his tenure was not worth a twelve-month's purchase; while his silence on all such delicate matters was often rewarded with entire impunity! In short, the vestry was the parson's master; and boasted of being so. And numerous were the cases in which their domination disported itself in the most wanton gambols of caprice. For example; a deacon had visited England for the purpose of obtaining priest's orders. On his return, he found that his parishioners had graciously relieved him of all responsibility, by placing another clergyman in his room. And, although he went back to the place, armed with such authority as the governor could impart, the people peremptorily refused to receive him; and he was left without redress. Again,—on account of some dispute with his vestry, one Mr. Latané, a French gentleman of learning and piety, was shut out of his Church. That they might not be stigmatized with the imputation of arbitrary proceedings, it was necessary that some cause should be assigned for the ejection of their minister. And what was their "most exquisite reason" for the act? why, truly, Mr. Latané "had a small tang of French in his speech, so that they could not well understand him!" It must be allowed, indeed, that they took abundant time to assure themselves of this defect; for Mr. Latané had officiated among them for seven whole years, without the slightest impeachment of his accentuation. To crown these abominable absurdities, it was not unusual, in case of a vacancy, by death or otherwise, for the people to refuse to elect a successor; and this, purely that they might escape the payment of a salary which did not exceed eighty pounds per annum.

There was yet another, though subordinate, source of disorder and ill-will. The practice of employing lay-readers had found its way into the colonies. The persons so entrusted were, most commonly, the parish clerks; and very treacherously did these anomalous evangelists abuse the confidence reposed in them. They were often found to be most serviceable instruments, in the hands of a factious and discontented vestry. And, not unfrequently, when the clergyman happened to be absent, they seized the opportunity to supplant him in the respect and affection of his people.

And here, the “good haters” of all established religion will, doubtless, be prompted to exclaim,—behold the manifold evils of an Establishment! Behold the swarming mischiefs engendered by the unhallowed union between Church and State! And here, too, on the other hand, the friends of an Establishment may exclaim, with greater truth, behold the miseries resulting from the want of an effective Establishment! The foregoing statement must, surely, be sufficient to show that the Church had little which deserved the name of an Establishment, in Virginia. If the Church was allied to the State, it was an alliance which brought with it neither protection nor support. On the one hand, it left the clergy at the mercy of the people. And, on the other hand, it actually tempted the people to load their clergy with insult and annoyance; for, since the Church was, nominally and theoretically, under the protection of the State, the spirit of *political* discontent would frequently discharge itself by the safest and easiest channel,—namely, that of splenetic persecution, directed against the helpless ministers of what was still denominated the State Religion. To ascribe, therefore, the evils of that time to the pernicious operation of an Establishment, would be scarcely more reasonable, than to attribute the oppressions inflicted on this country, during the Commonwealth, to the vices of the *legal* Constitution of England, as consisting of King, Lords, and Commons. Besides, do the haters of establishments forget that in the colonies of Massachusetts and Connecticut, the congregational system was quite as closely connected with the State, as the Church of England was in Virginia; and yet, that these colonies are constantly produced “as examples of communities in which was found a degree of devoted piety and practical religion, unsurpassed in the history of any communities to the same extent!” And why was this? Evidently, because the ministers of Independence were *natives* of the country; and because,—whatever may be the merits or demerits of the congregational discipline,—that discipline was effectually brought out into action; or, at least, suffered no impediment from State-alliance. Whereas, in Virginia, the Church could hardly be said to have either State-alliance, or perfect independence;

“But, as it were, an after-dinner’s sleep,
Dreaming on both.”

She had to endure all the evils, and all the obloquy, incident to an Establishment; while she was stripped of every solid advantage, which can make an Establishment respectable or useful.

But, we repeat, the grand and cardinal mischief,—that which tended to embitter and perpetuate all other mischiefs,—was the absence of effective Episcopal restraint. We have seen that, for

the good ecclesiastical government of Virginia, the seat of Episcopal authority might just as well have been fixed at the Antipodes, as at Fulham, or at London House. "Whatever"—says Dr. Hawks—"may be thought of the claim of Episcopacy to be considered as the only Apostolic system of ecclesiastical order, one point, it is to be presumed, will be acceded to by all. It is this; that among those who hold to its propriety and necessity, there should be no unnecessary delay in furnishing to a distant church an officer so important as a bishop. A community of Episcopal Churches, without a bishop to preside over them, must be viewed, upon the system of Episcopalians, as a body without a head." And, until this want should be supplied, there was, manifestly, but little hope of *prosperity* or *stability* for the Virginian Church.

We are, next, to contemplate this same Church, not as the predominant religious communion of the colony, but as exposed on all sides to the rivalry, and the hatred, of a multitude of sects. We learn from Dr. Hawks that, about the year 1731, several presbyterian societies had sprung up, and had found an unmolested position in the remoter parts of the colony. In 1740, Virginia was visited by the celebrated Whitfield. His ministrations had the effect of partially reviving a spirit of piety among the members of the Establishment. His efforts were speedily seconded by the untiring energy of an extraordinary individual, by the name of Morris. The attainments of this man were extremely limited. Not so, his zeal. It so happened, however, that his exertions, instead of tending to the benefit of the Episcopal Church, eventually prepared the way for an extension of the Presbyterian influence. And such was the success of that denomination, that in 1745, the governor found it necessary, in his address to the grand jury of the general court, to administer a solemn warning against the introduction of forms of religious worship, opposed to the Establishment. In this document we find complaints, that certain false teachers had crept in; who without order, license, or testimonials, and "under the pretended influence of new light, extraordinary impulse, and such like *satirical* and enthusiastical knowledge, were leading the innocent and ignorant people into all kinds of delusion; blaspheming the sacraments of the Church, and reviling her excellent liturgy." And it concludes by proclaiming the duty of "taking cognizance of such wickedness, whereby the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is turned into lasciviousness." This tragical representation was, probably, occasioned by the passionate, and, perhaps, intemperate language, in which the Presbyterian ministers had occasionally spoken of the degenerate condition of the

Episcopal Church. In the meantime, the Presbyterian interest continued to expand itself, under the auspices of the Reverend Samuel Davies, a divine of that communion, who is still held by them in honorable remembrance for his piety and talent. At length, by the exertions of this minister, a declaration was procured from the Attorney-General, Sir Dudley Rider, that the English Act of Toleration was likewise the law of Virginia. The firm position thus obtained by Dissent, appears to have provoked to a holy jealousy the spirit of a pious and exemplary layman, named Morgan Morgan. His affection for the Church was ardent, but wholly untainted by fanaticism. In the deplorable destitution of ordained pastors, this devoted man passed his life in the performance of every religious office and ministration which could be fitly undertaken by a layman. "He was a welcome visitant every where, and was beloved by rich and poor. And, what does not often happen, when the services of the Church are kept up by a layman,—he had large and attractive audiences. The character of the man was his passport to attention; and his love for the Church of his fathers stimulated the love of others. It is firmly believed that the fruits of his labours will long be traced in the valley of Virginia. His bones are now resting in the Church-yard of Mill-Creek Church. And though his name on earth was but little known out of the immediate sphere of his usefulness, yet, doubtless, he shall be better known at the resurrection of the just."—(p. 111—113.)

The year 1748 is distinguished, in the ecclesiastical history of the colony, by a law of the Assembly, to the effect that "every minister *received* into a parish, is entitled to all the spiritual and temporal benefits of it, and may maintain an action of trespass against any person who shall disturb him in the possession and enjoyment thereof." If this act had been passed when a public maintenance was first assigned to the clergy, it might have secured to the Church a succession of much abler and worthier ministers. As it was, it came far too late to remedy the evils which had been accumulating since the foundation of the colony. Besides, it would appear that the "temporal benefits" now secured and guarded by the law, were themselves deplorably insufficient for the respectable support of the ministers of religion. In 1755 a petition was preferred to the legislature by the clergy, representing that the salary appointed for them by law was so scanty, that they had much difficulty in maintaining themselves and their families, and that they were wholly unable to make provision for their widows and children, who were generally left to the charity of friends. They further submitted, that the small encourage-

ment given to clergymen was the reason why so few resorted to the colony from the two universities, and that so many, who were a disgrace to the ministry, found opportunities to fill the parishes. So that an increase of the clerical salaries would eventually prove a blessing to the whole community. The pressure of an expensive war with the French was fatal to the success of their petition. But this was not the heaviest of their discouragements; for, in 1757, the unparalleled distress occasioned by the failure of the tobacco-crop, compelled the legislature to substitute a money payment to the clergy for a payment in produce. The clergy felt themselves bitterly aggrieved by a measure which enabled the holders of tobacco to realize enormous profits from the advance of its price, and yet authorized them to pay their ministers at a low and specified pecuniary rate. Their discontent produced a war of pamphlets, for which, it must be allowed, the clerical body was then but ill prepared. The life and conversation of many among them had been by no means such as to turn the edge of the imputation, that they were more anxious to enrich themselves, than to benefit the souls of their congregations. The people, who at first laughed at the quarrel, became gradually excited to a more lively interest in it; till at length the popular current set in with such violence against the clergy, that the printers of the colony shut the presses against them, and their advocate, Commissary Camm, was under the necessity of resorting to Maryland for publication.

It was in the midst of this growing disaffection that the Baptists began to be formidable in the colony; and, from that time, they proved as thorns in the eyes, and scourges on the sides, of the Episcopal Church. Their hearts were deeply embittered by the memory of oppressions which had been inflicted on their own communion in former days, when not only the colony, but the whole Christian world, were strangers to the principles of toleration; and they were now fully prepared to "better the instruction" which their enemies had imparted. They had been gradually strengthened with that moral force which persecution so often confers upon its victims. And, as Dr. Hawks remarks, the opposition they had encountered provided them with another valuable element of power. It furnished them with a common ground on which to make resistance. Their creed alone would have supplied them with no such advantage; for, of all the sectarians that could be named, there were none so torn to pieces by dissension as the Baptists. To say nothing of their great division into Regulars and Separates, "some held to predestination, " others to universal provision; some adhered to a confession of " faith, others would have none but the Bible; some practised

“laying on of hands, others did not.” But, whatever might be their disagreements, on one point their hearts were as the heart of one man,—they were quite unanimous in their vindictive hostility to the Church. And when they were assembled on this *common ground*, their battle showed no signs whatever of unsteadiness or wavering.

Undismayed by the portentous signs of the times, the clergy were resolved on one final struggle against the Act of 1757. This act, on reference to the King in council, was denounced as an usurpation, and declared to be utterly null and void. On the strength of that decision, the case of the Reverend Mr. Maury was brought to trial; and justice was defeated by a verdict of one penny damages! The Court refused a new trial; the refusal was welcomed with boisterous acclamations; and the successful advocate, Patrick Henry, was carried out of Court, in triumph, upon the shoulders of the mob. The issue of this case virtually decided the fate of all others involving the same question, and the clergy found it necessary to abstain from all further attempts to extort justice from tribunals, where popular interest and passion were evidently the presiding powers.

It is gratifying to learn that this combination of disheartening occurrences was unable to suppress the desire, long cherished in the colony, for the blessing of a resident bishop. For many years, the mother-country had been urged, by repeated applications, to strengthen the Colonial Church with the presence of a ruler. At first, the efforts of the clergy were supported by the cordial co-operation of the laity. This unanimity, however, gradually melted away before the heat of revolutionary feeling. Many who professed to love the Church, began to lose their respect for bishops. Their hearts were alienated from the land of their fathers, and from the whole scheme of her constitution, ecclesiastical as well as civil; and, of course, it was not to be supposed that Episcopacy would continue to find favour in their sight. In 1771 the people were quickly ripening for the great conflict which ended in the establishment of American independence. The aspect of the times was, therefore, calamitously inauspicious to any attempt for the introduction of a bishop from England. It would be impossible to detail, in these pages, the steps which, in spite of all discouragements, were taken, about that period, for the accomplishment of the object. It must suffice us to state, that the project proved abortive; that, nevertheless, its failure is not to be ascribed to any doubt of its importance on the part of the clergy; but rather to the persuasion entertained by the most intelligent portion of their body, that, under the pressure of exist-

ing circumstances, it would be wholly inexpedient to venture on the further prosecution of the design.

In 1775, the storm, which had long been gathering, burst upon America. The clergy, for the most part, were loyal to their Sovereign; and, many among them, whatever might be their view of the question at issue between the colonies and the mother-country, were entangled in conscientious scruples respecting the lawfulness of armed resistance to her authority. Not so the Baptists. The day of vengeance, which had long been in their hearts, was now close at hand. It found them in readiness for the work of merciless retribution; and to this they instantly addressed themselves, with all their faculties, and all their resources. They commenced against the Church a war of extermination. They knew no "compunctious visitings." Their hostility never slept for seven-and-twenty years. They fed their resentment fat with the ruin of the Establishment, which they detested with a worse than theological hatred. The assault began in 1776. They then assured the Convention that *their* patriotism was embarrassed by no religious scruples. They tendered the services of their pastors in promoting the enlistment of their youth. At the same time, they presented a petition that they might be allowed to worship God in their own way; to maintain their own ministers, separate from others; and to perform the rites of marriage and of sepulture, without paying the clergy of any other denomination. But this was the language of modesty itself, compared with what followed; and, of course, it met with a most encouraging reception. Freedom of conscience was speedily proclaimed in the "Declaration of Rights." But still the Church was fenced with the maxims of the common law, and with various statutory provisions yet unrepealed. Here was a rampart which called for instant demolition. And, according to the testimony of a *Baptist* chronicler, "the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Quakers, the Deists, and the covetous," joined themselves together in a holy crusade for its destruction. In perusing the account of the conflict which ensued, we could almost imagine that we had before us a prophetic narrative of the controversy which is raging among ourselves at the present day. The swarming petitions and memorials from both parties were at length referred to a Committee of the whole House. On this occasion, the chief antagonist of the Church was Jefferson; and by him the struggle is spoken of as the severest in which he ever was engaged.* After a series of desperate contests in that Committee, continued almost daily, from the 11th of October to the 5th of December, 1776, the discussion was terminated by the passing of an act,

* Jefferson's Works, vol. i. p. 32.

by which nearly all the outworks of the Church were laid low, in an instant. It repealed every law which rendered criminal the maintenance of any opinion in matters of religion. It abolished all penalties for neglecting to attend the services of the Church, or for resorting to any other mode of worship. It exempted Dissenters of every denomination from all contributions towards the support of the Episcopal Church. It secured, indeed, the arrears of salary which might be then due to the clergy; and these arrears the clergy were permitted to receive until the first day of the ensuing year. It, moreover, reserved such glebes as might already have been purchased, for the use of the episcopal clergy; and it set apart all such churches and chapels as were already built for the use of episcopalian worshippers. But, beyond this, it provided no protection whatever to the episcopal communion, which was thus effectually brought down to the common level of a sect. There still remained the question, whether religion *in general* should be supported by a *general* assessment; or, whether it should be left dependent on *voluntary contributions*. But it was thought fit to postpone the final settlement of this matter to *a more convenient season*. In the meantime the clergy were reduced to a deplorable state of destitution. Deprived of their livings, they were left without any certain or permanent support. Those who endeavoured to procure a subsistence by the exercise of their pastoral office, soon perceived that the bread afforded by the voluntary scheme, is scanty as well as bitter. Their difficulties were aggravated by the unpopularity of their politics, and by the general pressure occasioned by the demands of the revolutionary war. The labours of instruction and tuition, to which some would have willingly resorted for their maintenance, afforded but a meagre and precarious resource. "The thews and sinews" of the colonial youth were everywhere in requisition for the deliverance of their country. Many a stout lad shouldered the musket, or slung the rifle, at the age of fifteen or sixteen years; and, thenceforward, he and his weapon were never parted, except by death on the battle-field, or else by the final establishment of American independence. In such a state of things, the services of a literary teacher were about as much in request as the lessons of a dancing-master. But this was not all. Even those of the clergy who fortunately had glebes attached to their churches, and thus were enabled to continue their ministrations, were sometimes compelled, as it were, to hold the pastoral staff in one hand, and a slaughter-weapon, for defence, in the other. As an example of this, an account is given by Dr. Hawks, from a MS. in his possession, of a clergyman, who felt it unsafe to permit his family to accompany him to church, and who ascended the desk, and the

pulpit, with pistols concealed under his dress; and this, purely for the protection of his life against those of the congregation who could not endure the prayers for his Majesty the King of England. The courage of this man, it should be remembered, preserved him from interruption and assault. His house became the asylum of many of his persecuted brethren; and he lived to become a good citizen of the infant republic, and to see the Church of his affections rising from the dust. Tradition has preserved a multitude of instances, which clearly show the wretched condition to which the clergy were reduced. They had to encounter poverty, suspicion, insult, and violence. And, in one instance, the violence was accompanied with treachery and stratagem. A clergyman who had made himself odious by his fidelity to the cause of England, was called from his bed at night to visit a sick parishioner. On his way to the appointed place, he was seized by a concealed party of his enemies, dragged to a retired spot in the woods, stripped naked, tied to a tree, inhumanly whipped, and then left in that situation, until he was discovered the next morning, and relieved.

From 1776 to 1779, the question of general assessment, or pure voluntary contribution, for the support of religion, was hotly agitated at every successive meeting of the legislature. It appears that the friends of the voluntary scheme carried on the conflict under a perpetual apprehension of defeat: and therefore it was that they contrived to suspend the decision, from time to time, and to leave the matter for debate in the succeeding year. At length, the hour of their triumph arrived. In 1779, the public mind was ripe for the destructive vote. The general assessment was negatived: and thus was it proclaimed to the world, that states and legislatures are absolved from all obligation to show themselves nursing fathers to the Church of God. Among the agitators by whom this blessed consummation was effected, the Baptists claim the foremost place. It is the boast of their own historian, Semple, that of all the various denominations, they alone were uniform and inflexible in their opposition to the plan of a general assessment. Among the other sects, there was much dissension, on this point, between the ministers and their people. But the Baptists were, throughout, distinguished by a desperate fidelity to the voluntary system; and, at last, they enjoyed the sole and undivided glory of public remonstrance against all but arbitrary payments to the ministers of religion. The victory, however, still left their vengeance hungry. The glebes which, in former days, had been attached to many of the livings, had, as yet, escaped the talons of confiscation. But, now, the unsparing eye of the fierce sect was keenly fixed upon these last remnants of

superstitious bounty. With regard, however, to this closing act of spoliation, their unanimity was something less conspicuous than it had hitherto shown itself. When the question was put, in their general committee, whether or not the glebes were public property, it was carried in the affirmative by a majority of only one vote. That one vote sealed the fate of the Church lands: for never were the efforts of the Baptists relaxed until every acre of glebe was sold!

In April 1783, peace was restored, and America became a sovereign and independent nation. But the tempest, which had passed over the land, had left the Church in ruins. The tale of destruction was too plainly told by the spectacle of roofless and deserted sanctuaries, and broken altars, and a clergy either driven to exile, or pining in unpitied destitution. When the colonies first took up arms, Virginia could boast of ninety-five parishes, one hundred and sixty-four churches and chapels, and ninety-one episcopal ministers. When the conflict was over, and "the battle lost and won," twenty-three of her parishes were extinct or forsaken; of the remaining seventy-two, thirty-four were destitute of all religious ministrations; and only twenty-eight of her clergy were left to supply the rest. And, such had been the work of havoc among the sacred buildings, that, to this day, the traces of it are deplorably visible in the eastern parts of the state.

"It is scarcely possible"—says Dr. Hawks—"for the Churchman, even now, to look, without tears, upon the venerable remains of mouldering churches which meet his eye in the 'ancient dominion.' As he gazes upon the roofless walls, or leans upon the little remnant of railing which once surrounded a now deserted chancel, as he looks out through the openings of a broken wall upon the hillocks under which the dead of former years are sleeping, with no sound to disturb his melancholy musings save the whispers of the wind through the leaves of the forest around him, he may be pardoned should he drop a tear over the desolated house of God; and if he be a pious Churchman, the wreck around him may awaken thoughts of submission and humiliation, which will send him from the spot a sadder and a better man."—p. 155.

The first occurrence, by which the drooping hopes of the clergy were revived, was the Act of 1784, for the incorporation of parochial churches. By this statute, each parish was authorized to hold all glebe lands *already purchased*, all chapels and churches *already built*, together with their various appurtenances. The ministers, and vestries, thus incorporated, were, moreover, allowed to *acquire*, use, and enjoy property, provided the income thence arising should not exceed 800*l.* per annum. To the vestry, however, was assigned the sole power of ordering *all payments* of the monies of the Church: so that the purse-strings were placed in

the hands of the laity, and the clergy were still left, in a considerable measure, dependents on their discretion. With some exceptions, however, the law was considered, upon the whole, as equitable and satisfactory; and its enactment was hailed with thankfulness, as the earnest of brighter days in store for the Church. But, then, alas! came the secession of the Methodists, and the assumption, by John Wesley, of episcopal power,—an occurrence which “put rancour” in this cup of gladness. And then, too, arose the jealousy of Presbyterians and of Baptists, in violent insurrection against the concession of peculiar privileges to the communion which they hated. It is true, that the benefits of incorporation were equally within the reach of all religious denominations. But such benefits they spurned. All these things profited them nothing, so long as the Episcopalians were to be sharers in the advantage. If we are to judge them by their doings, the destruction of the Church was infinitely dearer to the sectarians, than the acquisition of power and resources for their own societies. And, unfortunately, in Mr. Jefferson they found a faithful representative of all, and much more than all, their discontents. It was chiefly by the instrumentality of this individual, that the act of December, 1785, was passed, for the establishment of religious freedom; or, as it might rather be entitled, an act for the establishment of freedom from all religion; an act, which,—to use the triumphant language of its author,—“comprehended, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew, the Gentile, the Christian, the Mohammedan, the Hindoo, and *infidel*, of every denomination,”* and exempted all alike from the infliction of civil incapacity.

“That these various classes”—observes Dr. Hawks—“should have been protected, both in person and property, is obviously the dictate of justice, of humanity, and of enlightened policy; but it surely was not necessary in securing to them such protection, to degrade, not the establishment, *but Christianity itself* to a level with the voluptuousness of Mohammed, or the worship of Juggernaut: and if it be true that there is danger in an established alliance between Christianity and the civil power, let it be remembered that there is another alliance not less fatal to the happiness, and subversive of the intellectual freedom of man—it is an alliance between the civil authority and infidelity: which, whether formally recognised or not, if permitted to exert its influence, direct or indirect, will be found to be equally ruinous in its results. On this subject, revolutionary France has once read to the world an impressive lesson, which it is to be hoped will not speedily be forgotten.”—pp. 178, 179.

The Church was now thrown entirely on her own resources:

* Jefferson's works, vol. i. pp. 36, 37.

and she proceeded to action with the spirit which became an independent, though depressed, communion. The 18th of May, 1785, was distinguished by the assembling of the first Convention, which was held after the war of the revolution. The first step taken by them was the preparation of an address to the Protestant Episcopalians of Virginia, representing the prostrate condition of her affairs, and fervently soliciting co-operation in her righteous cause. The next was, to recommend, that immediate measures should be taken by the vestries to procure, by voluntary subscriptions, a competent maintenance for their incumbents. It was, then, ordained, that no person should enter on the pastoral care, without satisfactory testimonials to his moral and religious character; and provision was made for the speedy trial of delinquent clergymen of every grade. Pluralities and non-residence were strictly forbidden. The use of the surplice and the gown was positively enjoined. It was enacted that one sermon at least should be preached in every church each Sabbath day; that the children should be regularly catechized; and that the eucharist should be duly administered at stated periods. And, lastly, it was resolved that the Liturgy of the Church of England should be used, with such alterations as had been rendered necessary by the American revolution. But still, of all the evils, which then oppressed the Church, none was felt so bitterly, as the want of the Episcopal presence. It would appear that this want might have been speedily supplied, if the impatience of the clergy had not been overruled by that prudent regard to circumstances, which dictated a forbearance from all attempts to obtain consecration for American bishops, from any church but that of England, until all prospect of obtaining it there should be found utterly hopeless. In the mean time, with a view to preserve ecclesiastical discipline from total relaxation, clerical district visitors were appointed, who should discharge the office of *superintendence*, so far as that office might fall within the competence of *Presbyters*.

And here, the materials of the narrative begin to thicken so rapidly, that we almost despair of any thing short of failure, in the attempt to trace a distinct and faithful outline of the history. The thirty years which followed the American revolution were a period of incessant struggle; during which the Church appeared, at times, to be pressed *beyond measure and above strength*. We must content ourselves with a brief notice of the more prominent occurrences, which distinguished that protracted and fiery trial, from which she has since emerged, as gold comes forth from the furnace.

And, first among the calamitous events which came upon her was the repeal, in 1787, of the act of incorporation. But even

this blow, heavy as it was, left something still to be desired by her enemies. They had not, as yet, succeeded in procuring a distribution of her property. As Dr. Hawks remarks, "they had but left her to commence her work anew, in a condition similar to that in which she stood at the commencement of the revolution: with this difference, however, in her favour, that she had assumed an organized form, and both knew her friends and her enemies." In the mean time, an event of great importance had taken place,—the meeting of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church of the United States, on the 10th of October, 1786. Before this assembly was laid a most gratifying communication from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, enclosing an act of parliament, authorizing the consecration of bishops for the American Church. Various adverse circumstances, however, prevented the Church of Virginia from taking immediate advantage of this act. Her first *elected* bishop, Dr. Griffiths, being disabled by poverty from undertaking the voyage necessary for his consecration, resigned his episcopal charge in 1789. His relinquishment of the office was speedily followed by his death: and, in 1790, the Rev. James Madison was elected by the Convention to succeed him. On the 19th of September, in the same year, he was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London and Rochester: and, upon his return, "the Episcopal Church of Virginia, after an existence of one hundred and eighty-four years, saw, for the first time, a bishop within her borders." The year 1792 is remarkable for the first episcopal visitation held in Virginia: and the bishop had the satisfaction to find the condition of the Church more promising than he appears to have anticipated. The clergy, though still unprovided with a decent maintenance, were, for the most part, exemplary and diligent in the discharge of their sacred functions: and the zeal and devotion of the laity were not wholly extinct. The congregations were, in general, numerous, and attentive to the forms of worship prescribed by the ritual of the Church. He nevertheless perceived, with dismay and sorrow, that two formidable adversaries were at work to counteract her influence, and to resist her progress. On the one side, the dark soul of fanaticism was upon her; on the other, the scornful eye of infidelity. And, to those who have deeply studied human nature, it will appear no strange thing, that these two enemies were found to exhibit decided marks of close kindred with each other. Of all the fanatics, the Baptists were, at that time, the most dangerous. And yet, it was precisely among the Baptists, that the power of religion seems to have sunk into the most fatal decay. Their own historian in-

forms us, that “the war, though very propitious to the liberty of
 “the Baptists, had an opposite effect upon the life of religion
 “among them. From whatever cause, certain it is that they
 “suffered a very wintery season. With some few exceptions, the
 “declension was general throughout the State. The love of
 “many waxed cold. Some of the watchmen fell. Others
 “stumbled. And many slumbered at their post. Iniquity
 “greatly abounded.” But, whatever might be the general inconsistency of their lives, in one particular their uniformity continued quite unimpeachable. Nothing could exceed the steady perseverance of their assault upon the property of the Church. When the question respecting that property was revived in 1794, the Baptists, as usual, were foremost in the conflict. For eight years from that time, the contest was carried on with a vehemence grievously injurious to the cause of religion. At last, the crisis came. “On the 12th of January 1802, the legislature passed
 “the law, by virtue of which, the glebes of Virginia were ordered to be sold for the benefit of the public. The warfare
 “begun by the Baptists seven-and-twenty years before, was now
 “accomplished. The Church was in ruins; and the triumph of
 “her enemies was complete.” We shall leave Dr. Hawks to describe the *benefits* derived to the public from this deed of spoliation:

“The very natural inquiry will here be proposed, ‘What was the effect of this law, and how far were the people benefited by the sale of the glebes?’ We answer this inquiry in the words of one of our contemporaries, who has always lived in Virginia:—‘Under this act, not only glebes, but churches, and even the communion plate, have been sold.’ ‘The purchasers of the glebes have, in every instance where a sale has been made, paid, as it were, almost nothing for them.’ After all that has been done, how has the public been benefited, either in a moral or pecuniary way? If it has been benefited, let those who can, show it. It is denied that the public has in any way derived the least benefit from the sale of any of the glebes which have been sold. It is well known that in some counties the money has got into the hands of *some* of the overseers of the poor, and there it has remained.

“Nay, at this moment, should we ask where are the vessels which were once consecrated to the service of Almighty God, to be used in that holy sacrament which the Redeemer instituted ‘for a perpetual memory of his death and sacrifice, until his coming again,’ what must be the answer? The sacred vessels of the temple have been scattered; they have passed in some instances into impious hands. Within our own times has the fact occurred, that a reckless sensualist has administered the morning dram to his guests from the silver cup which has often contained the consecrated symbol of his Saviour’s blood! In another instance, the entire set of communion plate of one of the old churches is in the hands of one who belongs to the society of Baptists.

It has fallen to the lot of the Bishop of Virginia, in the course of his visitations, to witness the conversion of a marble baptismal font into a watering-trough for horses. These facts last recorded did not take place by virtue of the law of 1802; for that authorized no sale of the *furniture* of the church: but still they are a consequence of that law; they prove that when once the decree has gone forth which touches what a church claims as its lawful rights—when once the public are taught that their legislators feel obliged, on such a subject, to yield to their demands—the barrier is broken down; might makes right; and no man can foretell how far the zeal of the people will outstrip the intentions of their legislators. It is a fact worthy of notice that the records of history present few or no instances in which the spoliation of property devoted to literary or ecclesiastical purposes, has not failed, first, to accomplish the benefit which was avowed as the cause of the interference with it; and, secondly, to be stayed within the limits contemplated by those who advised it.

“In view of the facts just related, we are constrained to say, that if in her former prosperous condition the Church in Virginia had sinned more deeply than she is accused of having done, even by her enemies, verily, in the ruin which we have seen overtake her, she has made an ample, and, to her, costly atonement.”—p. 235—237.

The Convention of 1805 opened with an attendance of fifteen clergymen, and sixteen laymen! But this remnant, though miserably feeble in number, was still resolute in purpose. In order to preserve the Church from perishing for want of clerical ministrations, they resolved on a system of itinerancy, as a temporary expedient, to be continued until brighter days should enable them to dispense with it. The period from 1805 to 1812, was a dreary interval, scarcely visited with a gleam of hope. “It was the dark day of the Church.” The gloom was not relieved even by the form of a single conventional meeting. Bishop Madison himself was gradually bowing down beneath two burdens,—the care of William and Mary College, and the oppressive anxieties of his episcopal charge. On the 6th of March 1812, he finally sunk under the load: and the necessity of appointing a successor was the first occurrence which awakened the Church from the deadly frost-sleep which had long been creeping upon her. The vacancy, however, remained for a time unfilled; for, Dr. Bracken, on whom the election fell, declined the episcopal office: and it was not till May 1814, that the see was occupied by its present venerated diocesan, the Right Reverend Richard Channing Moore. It is a melancholy circumstance that the Journals of the Convention, by whom this choice was made, record the presence of only *seven* clergymen, and *seventeen* laymen! “Seven clergymen were all that could be convened, to transact the most important measure that conventions are ever called on

“ to perform ; and this, in a territory, where, once, more than
 “ ten times seven regularly served at the altar. We look back
 “ further still, and find the Church, after the lapse of two hun-
 “ dred years, numbering about as many ministers, as she possessed
 “ at the close of the first eight years of her existence.”

But,—cheerless and dispiriting as the circumstances were, under which the solemnity was held,—from this moment we may reasonably date the revival of the Church of Virginia. The new bishop was a most devout and faithful man : and his untiring efforts to lift up the prostrate Church, were effectually aided by the activity of those among his clergy who were not disabled by the weight of years. Of these there were four, whose names are more especially deserving of honourable remembrance ; the Rev. Dr. Wilmer, the Rev. Mr. Norris, the Rev. Mr. Dunn, and Dr. Meade, the present assistant Bishop of Virginia. The three first have entered into the rest of God. The last still survives, and prosecutes his work with all the zeal and energy of his earlier days.

We cannot prevail upon ourselves to dismiss the event of Bishop Moore's election, without particular notice of a most remarkable occurrence ; which would seem to show that the thoughts of God had, for some time past, been for good, and not for evil, towards this afflicted communion. In the latter part of 1788, Bishop Moore had accepted the rectorship of St. Andrews, in Staten Island. This field of labour he continued to occupy for twenty-one years ; and here he reared for himself a memorial, such as a Christian minister may well contemplate with thankfulness. His flock increased so greatly, that it was found necessary to erect a chapel on the north side of the island, which was soon filled with attentive hearers. “ Indeed it may be questioned”—says Dr. Hawks—“ whether the labours of any one
 “ clergyman in the Episcopal Church, have been more abundantly
 “ blessed than those of this prelate. With a manner the most
 “ persuasive and affectionate, mingled with great earnestness of
 “ feeling, and undoubted piety, his preaching has, by the Spirit's
 “ blessing, found its way to the heart of many a hearer.” It was during his ministry at Staten Island that the incident took place, to which we now allude, and which will be best related in the language of Dr. Hawks :

“ It was at one of his stated lectures in the church, that after the usual services had concluded, and the benediction been pronounced, he sat down in his pulpit, waiting for the people to retire. To his great surprise, he soon observed that not an individual present seemed disposed to leave the church ; and, after the interval of a few minutes, during which a perfect silence was maintained, one of the members of the con-

gregation arose, and respectfully requested him to address those present a second time. After singing a hymn, the bishop delivered to them a second discourse, and once more dismissed the people with the blessing. But the same state of feeling, which had before kept them in their seats, still existed, and once more did they solicit the preacher to address them; accordingly he delivered to them a third sermon; and, at its close, exhausted by the labour in which he had been engaged, he informed them of the impossibility of continuing the services on his part, once more blessed them, and affectionately entreated them to retire to their homes." —pp. 249, 250.

Now, here, let it be carefully recollected, that the incident in question had been preceded by nothing like a process of artificial preparation. No inflammatory religious drugs, no spiritual *sina-pisms*, had been employed by him, to rouse the languid circulation of devotional feeling. "Prayer, public and private,—the stated worship of the Church,—her comfortable Sacraments,—and the faithful preaching of the Gospel,—were all the machinery of which he knew the lawfulness, or the use. He had been perseveringly engaged in the use of these, for a length of time, until, *at an hour when nothing unusual had occurred to produce any solemn effect*, the minds of the people seemed to be simultaneously awakened to the infinite value of divine things." Here, then,—we may surely remark,—was something very like a religious *revival*; but without any of that turbulent "pomp and circumstance," which so often mark the unnatural eruptions of *theopathy*, generally known by that name. We hear nothing of the midnight assemblage,—the "*anxious benches*,"—the loud and passionate appeal,—the frantic paroxysm,—the breaking up of the great abyss of animal emotion,—the calling of one deep unto another. On the contrary,—without the smallest attempt to *get up a scene*,—without the faintest expectation of a crisis,—nay, to the utter astonishment of the preacher himself—the hearts of the Congregation suddenly burn within them; but, still, with a flame so pure and gentle, that it produces only an unusual thirst for the waters of life, and a respectful solicitation that the supply may be continued. We, therefore, can scarcely wonder at the opinion afterwards expressed by the Bishop, that "although we have the promise of heaven to be always present with us, yet there may be peculiar seasons, in which the Almighty displays his power in a manner so overwhelming, as to command the attention of his rational creatures; to dispel that coldness which makes them indifferent to the calls of duty; to compel the offenders into contrition; and to oblige them to sue for forgiveness at the throne of Grace."

And here let us pause, for a moment, to contemplate the striking

contrast between that reverential caution which always presides over a well-regulated, though ardent mind, like that of Bishop Moore, and "the sound and fury" which too often mark the operations of revivalism, when conducted upon the principle of *high pressure*. The following account of certain Revival Sayings and Doings is taken from a volume recently published by Doctors Cox and Hoby; who went over, as Delegates from the Baptists in this country, to their brethren in America. The whole exhibition is painfully instructive: and, of all the phenomena which it displays, there is none, perhaps, more worthy of observation, than the exhaustion and collapse which usually follow the spiritual debauch.

"At the time of my arrival in Montpelier there was a considerable excitement, in consequence of the visit of a celebrated revivalist, one who drove religion forward with a reckless fury. He was to address young people the same evening: and he pursued his systematic course of *moral mechanism* for several days. This term appears to me accurately to express the facts. I afterwards came into another scene of his operations, the effect of which had been, when the fermenting elements had subsided, to leave, in more than one religious community, a residuum of spiritual coldness, bordering on a disinclination to all religion; and productive, for a time, of total inaction. From delicacy, I conceal his name, while recording a specimen of his proceedings. After repeated prayers and appeals, by which he almost compelled multitudes to repair to the anxious seats, he asked again and again, if they loved God. They were silent. 'Will you not say that you love God? Only say you love, or wish to love God.' Some confessed; and their names, or their numbers, were written down in a memorandum book, to be reported as so many converts. It was enough to give an affirmative to the question. But many were not readily, and without continual importunity and management, induced to the admission. He would continue—'Do you not love God? Will you not say, you love God?' Then, taking out his watch,—'there, now; I give you a quarter of an hour. If not brought, in fifteen minutes, to love God, there will be no hope of you. You will be lost—you will be damned!' A pause, and no response. 'Ten minutes have elapsed: five minutes only left for Salvation! If you do not love God, in five minutes, you are lost for ever!' The terrified candidates confess—the record is made—a hundred converts are reported!" —*The Baptists in America; by Drs. Cox and Hoby, 1836, p. 180.*

The Convention of 1815, which immediately followed the election of Bishop Moore, afforded a most gratifying example of the virtue which often goes forth from the presence of one energetic and devoted man, even when all external circumstances seem to speak of nothing but despair. "Men's hearts were not now, as "in times of old, *failing them for fear* that all was lost." The assemblage of the Clergy was now just double of what it had been in the preceding year; and the cause was further strength-

ened by the appearance of eight and twenty lay representatives. The Bishop, in his address, declared that he had found all the parishes, which he had visited, pervaded by a fervent desire to repair the waste places, and to restore the Church of their ancestors to its primitive purity and excellence. On several occasions, he had seen tears burst from the Congregation, upon the bare mention of the glory which once rested on the Church of Virginia; and, in these emotions, he read a forcible assurance that *it pitied them of her ruins*, and that they would no longer be passive and indolent spectators of her prostration. Parishes which, for years, had been, to all appearance, lifeless, now shook themselves from their deadly sleep, and started up into activity and vigour. He found, in short, that fire had, all along, been slumbering beneath the embers; and that, in many places, it had burst forth, with a vividness, which was worthy of the brightest Gospel times. The sacred element had been powerfully stirred by the zeal and labour of those among the Clergy who were in the prime of life; and who, each of them, devoted his fresh and youthful capacities, without sparing, to the work of an Evangelist. With a truly missionary ardour, they carried the standard of Christ throughout a considerable portion of the Church. They went out into the highways and hedges, preaching the truths of their Divine Master; and they faithfully adorned his doctrine by their walk and conversation among the people. It is gratifying to add, that a becoming spirit of liberality was manifested by the laity towards their ministers, who were, generally, left in dependence on the bounty of their Congregations.

The year 1818 is signally memorable for the establishment of a society for the education of young men, desirous of entering into the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The proceedings of this body were, at first, upon a comparatively limited scale. But the design gradually expanded itself far beyond the original hopes of the projectors; and the ultimate result was the foundation of the Theological School of Alexandria; a seminary which, at this day, is constantly advancing in prosperity and usefulness, and stands an honourable monument of the piety and zeal of the Churchmen of Virginia. Within the last three years, it has afforded instruction to sixty candidates for orders, and has given thirty-six Clergymen to the Church.

Henceforward, the history of the Church presents an animating spectacle of rapid improvement. We have no space, however, for further details. We must be content with stating, that the diocese now contains no less than one hundred Churches, and more than seventy Clergymen; and that the whole aspect of affairs is such as to draw from the historian an affectionate and solemn warning against the dangers of prosperity.

It may, here, possibly be asked, whether the above representation of the Church's flourishing condition in Virginia does not establish, beyond all doubt, the efficacy of the voluntary system, for the support of every religious denomination? The glebes, it may be said, are gone. All compulsory payments are gone. And yet the Church is in a state which fills the hearts of its friends with thankfulness and hope. In replying, however, to this not unreasonable inquiry, there are several very important matters to be taken into consideration. And, *first*, with regard to the Church of Virginia; it is true that she has neither glebe, nor tithe, nor revenue of any kind, secured by legal compulsory enactment. But, then, it is also true that the condition of Virginia is, in some respects, so peculiar, that the want of such resources has, up to the present moment, been, comparatively, but little felt. She has a territory abounding in all the necessities of life, and inhabited by a singularly generous, hospitable, and warm-hearted race of people. The injuries and oppressions inflicted upon her Church have had the effect of mightily strengthening the fidelity and attachment of her Churchmen, and of animating them with a noble spirit of liberality in support of the Episcopal Communion. And, lastly, it so happens that, since the Revolution, many of the Clergy in Virginia are the sons of good families, possessed of property in the State, and are surrounded by large circles of wealthy and munificent connections. And, under these circumstances, it is far from surprising that the voluntary system has not, as yet, broken down beneath the demands of the Church.

But, *secondly*, it would be the greatest of all mistakes to imagine that this Church, or any other Church in America, put their trust in the voluntary scheme, as a permanent resource. They do no such thing. Some property the Church of Virginia has actually acquired since the Revolution; and it is not improbable that she may acquire more. She is naturally anxious to place herself in a condition similar to that of several other dioceses in the Union, in which particular Churches are still possessed of property. Part of that property was theirs before the Revolution, and was never taken from them by the legislature; and part has been acquired since, and has greatly increased in value. In some instances these funds are actually sufficient to support the incumbent; or, at any rate, to reduce the tax on pews to a very trifling amount. There is one Church positively in a state of opulence; namely, Trinity Church in the city of New York. The source of her wealth is a piece of land which was bestowed upon her in the reign of Queen Anne. At that time, the farm in question was worth 400*l*. At present its value is very great; for, as we have heard, the city stands upon that very land. And nobly indeed does Trinity Church—the Mother-Church of the whole diocese—dis-

pense her riches to her surrounding family ! The vestry use the funds entrusted to them for the benefit of all. They give, annually, to each Church in the city, the interest of a very large sum. They help to build new Churches. They support the bishop of the diocese. They endow Professorships and Scholarships in the Colleges and Theological Schools. And, sometimes they even help the Church in another diocese, by a liberal donation. So much for the reliance of the whole Episcopal Church of the United States upon the sole might and virtue of the Voluntary Scheme ! But,

Lastly,—is it among the other religious denominations that faith in the Voluntary System is found to flourish ? Nothing of the kind. Several of them are amply endowed already ; and all of them are, more or less, intent upon endowments. All are buying lands for their Schools and Churches, and looking to the future augmentation of their value, as the source of an abundant revenue. We have heard that the Reformed Dutch, in New York, are nearly, if not quite, as rich as Trinity Church ; and by similar means. The Independents of New England possess property. Their Harvard University, in particular, is well endowed, by funds obtained from England, before the Revolution. The Independents of Connecticut have Yale University,—also endowed. The Presbyterians have property in various parts of the country, belonging to their Schools and Churches. Nay, we have been told that the Baptists themselves—the aboriginal and inveterate enemies of all Church property—have, somehow or other, become reconciled to endowments settled on their own communion. In short, we believe it would turn out, upon inquiry, that not a single sect in the United States has entered into any self-denying ordinance against the acquisition of property, for the permanent support of their respective Interests.

Now, if all this be so, we may fairly toss to the winds the confident statements, and the sapient speculations, by which we, in this country, are eternally challenged to contemplate the glories of the Voluntary System, pure and undefiled, as manifested in the only land of civil and religious liberty. With respect, indeed, to the precise manner in which the endowments in America are settled and adjusted, our knowledge is at present but imperfect ; and we accordingly look forward with impatience to the future labours of Dr. Hawks ; which will doubtless supply us with the amplest information, respecting the condition of the American Church, in this, and every other particular of importance. We shall be, more especially, anxious for the volume, which, we believe, he has in preparation, presenting a view of her present constitution—a matter on which we fear that our countrymen are, generally, in a state of not very creditable ignorance. It cannot

be otherwise than deeply interesting to us, to learn the exact position in which the General Convention stands towards the Convention of each particular State—a position, we apprehend, in many respects analogous to that which is occupied by the civil government of the Union, in relation to the State-legislatures. Another most momentous particular, is the process by which Protestant bishops are elected in America. With regard to this, the following, if we are not mistaken, is, commonly, the outline of the proceeding. The vestry of each parish is chosen by the congregation; and lay delegates are elected by the vestry. On the day of election, the nomination of a fit person for the Episcopate is made by the clergy. The choice is then announced by the clergy to the lay-delegates, for their confirmation or rejection, the delegates of each congregation having *one* vote. In case of rejection, the clergy proceed to a fresh vote among themselves; and so on, until both clergy and laity are agreed. We have here, in full action,—and, hitherto, in safe and beneficial action,—the ancient principle which gave to the laity their share in the election of a bishop. The system has been found to have an orderly and harmonious operation. It very rarely happens that the choice of the clergy is negatived by the representatives of the laity. Indeed, in all the concerns of the Church which are purely of a spiritual nature, the laymen are generally disposed to acquiesce respectfully in the decisions of their ministers. But here, again, we await the more complete intelligence which will be derived from the promised publications of Dr. Hawks.

We cannot conclude without adverting for a moment to certain reflexions, which have been drawn from the historian, in the course of his narrative, on the firm tenacity of life which has often been displayed by the Episcopalian system.

“ Among the reasons,” he observes, “ which an intelligent Episcopalian renders for his attachment to the Church, he will not forget to mention the fact, that there seems to be in the system of Episcopacy what has been well termed ‘ a conservative principle,’ which secures the existence of the Church under circumstances the most calamitous; so that of all religious denominations, there is, perhaps, not one which requires the aid of a legal establishment less than does a church episcopally constituted. No American Christian, it is presumed, desires here a union of Church and State; and, of all American Christians, the Episcopalian probably has least need to desire it. The lessons of the past on this subject are strikingly impressive. The histories of the suffering churches of the Christians of St. Thomas in India, of the Waldenses, of the Scotch Episcopalians, together with that of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, all seem to attest the fact, that for the preservation of purity of doctrine and primitive discipline, in Episcopal churches, no union with the civil power is necessary. The first three were tried in the fiery furnace of persecution; and, unsustained by any

human aid, after years of suffering, came forth the same in doctrine and in discipline that they were when first called to exercise the virtue of patient endurance; while the last, though for a time prostrated in the dust, and clinging to existence by almost a single tie, has risen from her depression without the aid of a legal establishment; and holding on the even tenor of her way, is now exhibiting in her youthful strength, the same faith, embodied in the same form of sound words, and united to the same system of polity which formed her distinguishing features in the day of prosperity, before she was shrouded in the darkness of that cloud which for a time almost hid her from view. Surely, in the retrospect of facts like these, an Episcopalian may be pardoned, should he deem it something more than a fond fancy, that the Church of his affections does possess within herself a principle of preservation, and that 'the foundations of Episcopacy stand sure in the storm, not less than in the sunshine.'"—pp. 144, 145.

Dr. Hawks is doubtless aware that the preservation of the Episcopal succession among the Waldenses, is considered, by many, as a somewhat questionable matter. With this one exception, his remarks will be unanimously echoed by every faithful son of the Anglican Church. In fact, the tendencies of all religious bodies towards this frame of government, are constantly bearing an indirect, but most emphatic, testimony to the fact, that it contains, in its own nature, such powers of cohesion,—such elements of solidity and strength,—as never can belong to any other ecclesiastical constitution. It has been judiciously observed by the author of "Spiritual Despotism," that the Episcopal principle is perpetually striving to develope itself, even in those communions which most bitterly abhor the name. A remarkable instance of this is preserved by Dr. Hawks. In Semple's "History of the Baptists of Virginia," (pp. 58, 59,) he met with a remarkable attestation, furnished by the Baptists themselves, to the *expediency* of that form of government. It was needful, indeed, that their notions of *expediency* should be supported by the authority of Scripture; and accordingly, though *bishops* were held by them to be clearly unscriptural, they yet determined, at an association of the Churches, held in 1774, that *apostles* were officers which still belonged to the Church of Christ; and for this they relied on Eph. iv. 11—13. Upon the strength of this persuasion they actually proceeded to the choice of—*an apostle!* And the individual was set apart, for his apostolic office, by imposition of the hands of every ordained minister. His work was, to pervade the churches; to do, or, at least, to see to, the work of ordination; to set in order the things that were wanting; and to make report to the next Association. Soon after this, two other *apostles* were appointed. But now, mark the result. The *apostles* went forth upon their *visitation*; and wretched was the report which they

brought back with them to those from whom they received their *ordination*! Their function was set at nought, as having nothing apostolic in it. It was treated every where as a mere upstart contrivance, utterly destitute of divine authority, or sanctity. "It was," says Semple, "only the old plan of bishops, under a new name. And either the spirit of free government ran too high among the Churches to *submit*; or the thing, not being from God, soon fell." From all which we may safely gather two conclusions; first, that the necessity of Episcopal supervision was felt (as it always must be felt) by these sectarians; but, secondly, that Episcopacy itself can never be expected to prosper in the work whereto it is sent, if it be treated *merely* as a matter of human expediency,—as a thing that may be taken up and laid down at the bidding of convenience or caprice,—as a form which may be altered, or modified, or mutilated, or mimicked, just as circumstances may appear to dictate; and this without regard to the will of the Invisible Head of the Church, as disclosed in Scripture, and interpreted by the universal practice of the primitive communion.

The principle of an Episcopal succession, continued unbroken from apostolic times, effectually shuts out that irreverent imputation, which degrades Episcopacy to a mere human appointment, dictated chiefly by the exigencies of the moment. Of its expediency, indeed, we should apprehend, few reasonable men can entertain a doubt. And, for any thing that we can tell, this very expediency may have been present to the Supreme Intelligence, as one among the reasons for its appointment. But with His reasons for the ordinance, we have but little concern. We repeat, that slender hope can be entertained from any form of Church government which is not adopted, and applied, in a spirit of obedience to His sovereign will.

That the Episcopal form has, within itself, a principle of imperishable vitality,—and this, independently of all State-alliance,—is our steadfast belief. And this belief is mightily confirmed by the prosperous and effective condition of the American Church, subsequently to its severance from the State. It may be true that, in any country, the State incurs a fearful responsibility, in presuming to repudiate the Church. But it is glorious and consolatory to reflect, that the Church—if we may so express it—"bears a charmed life," which never can be quenched by the neglect, or the unfaithfulness, of the State.

We are, moreover, satisfied, that the American Episcopal Church presents the only firm embankment against that vast influx of Romanism, which, as we are informed, is perpetually rushing into the Union, together with the tide of immigration. We have heard it said, that a similar persuasion is entertained by some of

the best and most intelligent men of other denominations, in the United States. They have been magnanimous enough so far to forget their own peculiarities, that they are looking with the deepest interest to the Church, as containing within herself very much of the life and virtue of the Protestant cause. They rejoice in every accession to her strength, because they believe that, in the approaching strife, she will be found completely armed for the conflict, and ready to step forward into every post of toil and danger. Would to God that they might join her ranks; and that, under her banner, they might fight the Protestant battle against the compact forces of the Papacy! Whether they do this, or not, the Church well knows the part which she has to perform; and it would be grossly injurious to doubt that she has skill and courage for the most perilous emergency. Under the circumstances in which she now is placed, we trust that the faithful admonitions of her historian will hardly be needed to guard her against the temptations of *pride and fulness of bread*. *Abundance of idleness*, we are satisfied, will never be her bane.

We have now only to add, that the present volume has been rendered exceedingly valuable, for the purposes of reference, by an Appendix, containing the Journals of the Conventions held by the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia, from the year 1785 to 1835, inclusive.

ART. II.—*Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology*. By Rev. William Buckland, D.D., Canon of Christ Church and Reader in Geology and Mineralogy in the University of Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Pickering. 1836.

It was with many feelings of anxious curiosity that we prepared to cut open the leaves of these long-expected volumes, but as we proceeded in their perusal, those of increasing gratification prevailed, and we have not concluded our task without discovering in the structure of the work itself full and satisfactory explanation of the causes of that delay to which we have alluded. The great body of perfectly original information, which the author has not only brought forward, but fully worked out, on many interesting points with reference to the objects of this treatise, at once accounts for, and richly compensates, its somewhat tardy appearance. Those who have ever engaged in researches of this nature, involving so many details of physiology and comparative anatomy, are well aware of the gradual progress which necessarily affects such a train of new investigation. Thus, in the present instance, it will be seen, that on many points visits to distant and often foreign

museums, and an extensive correspondence with others pursuing similar inquiries, have contributed to give additional value to the information here accumulated.

Of the general character of the work thus produced, we can fairly say that it is every way calculated, not only to sustain, but very materially to enlarge the previous reputation of the author, although his name has long deservedly ranked among the very first in the science to which the present treatise relates. That science, indeed, owes much of the progress which it has for the last quarter of a century made in this island (generally acknowledged to have been the principal theatre of its advancement) to the great effect produced by the lectures of the Professor in the University of Oxford. In these he has ever been eminently successful in imparting to a numerous class the ardour and energy of his own powerful mind, and thus training as it were for the field an host of zealous, active, and highly qualified observers. In these days, when our oldest and most valuable institutions of education are exposed to so much unfounded obloquy, it may be useful to direct attention to the important aid both our universities have conferred, (for Cambridge has in this fully kept pace with her sister,) not merely in promoting the growth of the older and long-cherished objects of their attention, but, as true almæ-matres, in nursing as it were the infancy, and maturing into strength, the very youngest of the sciences committed to their protection.

To the general subject, however, of the efficiency of our universities in the promotion of the sciences, we have in a recent volume dedicated an entire article;* and we now only revert to the topic, as afresh suggested to us by this new and striking example of the positions we then maintained, for the purpose of observing that those who have never had the advantage of attending Professor Buckland's Oxford lectures, will find in this volume the best illustration of those peculiar powers of his mind which have rendered his academical instructions so very popular and effective. His former publications, although very valuable, were yet of too limited a range in their subjects to bring into such full display that unrivalled clearness of illustration, and ardent keenness of penetration, the surest characteristic of true genius, which so eminently distinguished him in the geological chair; talents, however, by no means confined to geology, but extending equally to every branch of natural history, and therefore especially adapted for the advancement of a science continually requiring all the resources of a complete knowledge of comparative anatomy, botany, and physiology, to illustrate the history of the new species of animals and vegetables, disinterred in great numbers and rapid

* British Critic, January, 1831.

succession from their sepulchres in the formations of distant ages; and adding such important supplements to our catalogues of recent species, that no zoologist or botanist can be considered as at all completely acquainted with his own sciences while he remains ignorant of these most material additions.

A general, perfectly informed, yet popular view of a science so interesting and extensive, and especially one which should fully develop all the leading principles of the restoration of the Fauna and Flora of a former world, has been undoubtedly a desideratum, which he who should adequately supply must be considered a valuable benefactor to our literature. And when, in addition to these gratifications of a scientific curiosity, fresh and unexpected proofs of the constancy and uniformity of the one great designing Intelligence, as exhibited through every age and under every change of external nature, overruling all those changes however violent, *riding in the whirlwind and directing the storm*, and educing from scenes of the wildest ruin the fair and goodly varieties of the present surface of our planet, all adjusted with the nicest adaptations to the best supply of the wants of all its inhabitants, and especially of man,—such a work, we say, must undoubtedly possess claims of a far higher description than the mere gratification of any curiosity, however elevated, can possibly afford.

But it is high time to proceed from these general and preliminary remarks, to give to our readers that means of judging for themselves of the justice of our commendation, which a regular analysis of the work will best afford. A short introductory chapter illustrates, by well-chosen and striking examples, the extent and interest of this department of science. Thus geology is shown to be closely connected with statistics, since the superficial extent occupied by the various formations very materially influences the distribution and occupations of the population of any country: still more obvious is its connection with physical geography, which, in fact, is little more than one branch of it; and it alone traces out for us the history of the various revolutions which the crust of our planet has undergone; records the regular order of superposition, in which the stratiform mineral masses composing it are arranged; and restores from their relics preserved in those strata various orders of animals and vegetables, now extinct, which have successively occupied our globe. “Arrangements like these,” it is well observed, “could not have originated in chance, since they afford evidence of law and method in the disposition of mineral matter, and still stronger evidence of design in the structure of the organic remains with which the strata are interspersed.” This sentence may be considered as involving the general argument which it is the great object of the treatise to

illustrate in detail. Before proceeding to that detail, however, a subject of such paramount importance must naturally force itself on the mind of every inquirer, that the Professor very properly pauses at the very threshold to devote a preliminary chapter to its full consideration; namely, how far the results of our geological observation can be reconciled with the sacred history of the creation. To some it may appear, perhaps, that it might have been more strictly logical to postpone this topic until the phenomena ascertained by those observations had been previously explained; but it is only with the general result that we are here concerned, and this result may be safely assumed for the time, leaving it to be established by the subsequent detail; while, on the other hand, few minds, that feel as they ought, could allow themselves to proceed with any satisfaction, unless first set at rest on this very momentous question. It were far too low a view of the subject if we should suppose a Christian philosopher merely arguing, in order to remove the prejudices of religious persons, in the same strain as the poetical apologist of Epicurus.

“ Illud in his rebus vereor, ne forte rearis
Impia te rationis inire elementa.”

The Christian philosopher, we say, will feel anxious, not merely lest his own science should be misunderstood and misrepresented, but still more lest, being unguardedly expressed, and unaccompanied by due explanations, it should be the means of shaking the faith of those who are weak and unstable: he will walk with all caution under the impressions so forcibly expressed in an admirable prayer with which the illustrious Kepler concludes his publication of those great laws of the universe which have immortalized his name. We are truly gratified in extracting a few phrases from this composition, which has been quoted at length by Professor Buckland.

“ Behold I have here completed a work of my calling with as much of intellectual strength as thou hast granted me. I have declared the praise of thy works to the men who will read the evidences of it, so far as my finite mind could comprehend them in their infinity; but if any thing unworthy of thee has been taught by me, do thou teach me, that I may correct it; and, finally, grant me this favour, that this work may never be injurious, but may conduce to thy glory and the good of souls.”
—p. 11.

The great point in which any inconsistency has been imagined to prevail between the conclusions deduced by scientific reasoning from the study of the works of the Creator, and those documents which on the strongest moral evidence we receive as his revealed word, relates to the age to be assigned to the existence of our planet. According to those facts of geology universally admitted, some nine-tenths of the crust of our globe are found to be con-

stituted of thousands of strata, exceeding many miles in their aggregate thickness, all evidently of derivative and secondary origin, and gradually accumulated by successive depositions in the channels of former oceans, estuaries, or lakes. Many of these strata are composed of little else than a congeries of fossil shells, and other organic remains, all of which are found under circumstances which clearly demonstrate their having lived and died on or near the spots where they are now buried; and they vary so much in the successive depositions, and are altogether so different from any recent species, as to indicate successive acts of creative power, exerted at distant intervals. Besides this, many of the older beds, after having become consolidated from their original state of semi-fluid mud, have been partially destroyed by subsequent convulsions, and their fragments embedded in newer rocks, which in their turn have undergone the same changes. A crust thus constituted obviously bears the same physical evidence of the lapse of time, as do the concentric annular zones of growth, which compose the substance of our forest timber; only that here we must reckon by ages instead of years. In these facts, then, we should undoubtedly find an alarming inconsistency with the narrative of Genesis, if that narrative did really (as it has been sometimes, but on very narrow grounds, assumed to do) limit the *original creation* of our earth to an epoch not more than 6000 years distant; but it is quite evident that not even the strictest literal interpretation of the text necessarily restricts us to any such conclusion; and it is most satisfactory to find that the larger interpretations, to which the phenomena necessarily incline us, do not in any manner originate in a desire to force the text of Scripture into an accordance with these phenomena, but have been previously sanctioned on perfectly independent grounds, by the authority even of Fathers of the Church. If we turn to the sacred record, we shall find that the first verse simply asserts the original creation of the heavens and earth by God, in opposition to all atheistic systems of cosmogony: the second verse describes the earth as already existing in a state of confusion and emptiness, (*tohu bohu*); and then follows the narrative of the six days' work, which finally prepared it as a fit habitation for the race of man—that race of which the providential history alone forms the proper subject of the Bible. Now it is quite clear that in all this there is nothing which can contradict the idea that a very considerable interval of time may have elapsed between the original act of creation as recorded in the first verse, and the commencement of the six days' work in the third verse. Dr. Pusey observes, in a valuable note which he has supplied to this part of his friend's work—"Nor is this any new opinion; many of the Fathers (they are quoted by Petavius, lib. c. cap. 11, § i.—viii.) supposed the two first verses of Genesis to contain an account of a distinct and prior act of

creation. And in Luther's Bible (Wittenberg, 1557), you have in addition, the figure 1 placed against the third verse, as being the *beginning* of the account of the Creation on the first day." Such an interpretation, therefore, cannot be considered as offering the least shadow of violence even to the strict letter of the sacred record; and it is amply sufficient; for all the successive revolutions which geological observation has detected may well have taken place in this undetermined interval. No objection to this supposition can reasonably be built on the silence of the sacred narrative; the whole matter is entirely foreign to the great subject of that record, and any allusion would have required a whole treatise on geology to render it intelligible. To have rendered the Bible a depository of all the subsequent discoveries of science allotted to man as the stimulus and reward of his high privilege of intellectual exertion, would have counteracted the evident designs of Providence in this respect. It would in effect have required, as the Professor has acutely and justly remarked, the transference to the human mind of something like the omniscience peculiar to the Divine Mind.

Such is the very satisfactory system of conciliation between the results of science and the declarations of Scripture embraced by our Professor, to whose whole chapter on the subject we would refer our readers as to a very masterly exposition of the argument we have here briefly stated. Others, both geologists and theologians, have, on independent grounds, been inclined to adopt a somewhat different view of the matter, and to consider the days of creation as really periods of millenary or longer duration, to which the term *days* is applied by a figure of speech not unknown in other portions of the scriptural writings. Many geologists have dwelt on the analogy between the order of productions stated in Genesis to have been successively called into existence, and those found preserved in the successive formations. Here, indeed, the Professor objects that in the very earliest formations we find, not only vegetables, but also testacea and fish. But some may, perhaps, answer, that the negative argument thus deduced from our uncertainty as to a still earlier era of vegetables, is far from fatal to this system. The great arguments in its favour seem to be built on the necessity which the other explanation involves of considering the sublime fiat in the third verse—"Let there be light"—to relate, not to the original creation of that element, (or rather the æther, on whose vibrations it depends,) but merely to recalling it to reappear, after it had been for a time withdrawn from, or obscured in, our system; since the animal remains of the very earliest strata, as we shall presently learn, possessed eyes, and therefore imply the previous existence of light. Again, if we adopt the view which represents the creative days as

periods, we have a record of successive eras of creations, each distinguished by the appearance of new races, "the diapason closing full in man," quite analogous in principle, and very nearly so in detail, with the conclusions of geology. But whichever view we may embrace as most accordant with sound principles of scriptural interpretation, either will remove every appearance of inconsistency with the observed phenomena of geology; and that science affords the fullest confirmation of the very recent appearance of the human race on our planet, to treat of whose history alone forms, as we have already observed, the one peculiar province of the Bible.

Having thus, we would hope satisfactorily, disposed of this most important preliminary topic, we are next called to accompany the Professor in investigating the direct evidences of design manifested by geological observation; first, as regards the constitution of the earth's crust, and the arrangement of the masses composing it; and, secondly, with respect to the organization of the races of animals and vegetables whose remains have been preserved in the successive formations.

With regard to the first of these subjects, although all the topics we shall enforce will be found derived from the treatise before us, we shall find it most convenient, from the limits to which we are restricted, to adopt an order and method of our own, such as will admit of the most distinct, and yet concise, illustration of our views.* We would first, then, state as briefly as we may those general facts developed by geology which may be considered as fully established by observation, whatever difference may still exist with regard to their theoretical explanation.

I. The lowest masses which we observe in examining the structure of the earth's crust consist of crystalline rocks, such as granite, gneiss, mica, slate, &c.: these contain no organic remains, but are very rich in metallic veins, some of the metals, e. g. tin, being exclusively found in them. These masses burst out from beneath the incumbent rocks, and are usually elevated, so as to form the highest ridges of the principal mountain chains. A great majority of geologists believe them to bear the undoubted marks of having been greatly modified by fire, and to have par-

* Dr. Buckland, after premising an account of the general phenomena, proceeds, as we have done, to consider, first, the arguments of design derived from the adjustments and relations evinced in the structure of the earth's crust; but anxious, apparently, to hurry into the more interesting subject of organic remains, he only very partially and briefly indicates these in his tenth chapter, and then, in the conclusion, returns to this unfinished argument by a series of chapters on the proofs of design in the disposition of the carboniferous strata, metallic veins, phenomena of springs, &c. These chapters are in themselves very valuable, and we regret we are only able so very briefly to allude to their contents as we have done in our text. But they are surely misplaced, and we trust, in another edition, we shall find them forming, as they logically should do, a sequel to chapter x.

tially undergone igneous fusion. The granite certainly sends out veins traversing fissures in the incumbent slates, &c. in a manner which it is nearly impossible to account for on any other hypothesis. On the whole, then, the protrusion of this series of primitive rocks, as they are called from their priority in position, and often also in age, appears to have materially influenced the elevation of the derivative series of deposits which cover them.

II. The latter class of derivative deposits occupy at least nine-tenths of our continent, occupying the lower lateral chains of the primitive mountain ridges, and the intervening lowland tracts, thus constituting what are geologically called basins. They abound in organic remains, of which the greater proportion are sea shells, corals and zoophytes. These are collected together in families, and often occur in such great quantities, that entire masses of rock consist almost exclusively of their fragments. This great series of depositions is made up of thousands of individual beds, which, from their general relations, are subdivided into the following principal groups, each distinguished by peculiar organic remains. We will distinguish these groups by the letters of the alphabet.

A. The rocks called transition, consisting of various beds of coarse fossiliferous slate and limestone; mines of copper, &c. occur in these rocks. The organic remains consist of peculiar sea shells, zoophytes, crustacea, and some fish, principally of the shark family. Some marine fucoid vegetables are also found, but land plants are much more abundant in the next group.*

B. The carboniferous series, or rocks including the principal beds of coal. These are so nearly related to the preceding group in their organic remains, that they are referred to the same great division by many geologists, whom Dr. Buckland follows in the present work; but they are, as the principal repository of our fossil fuel, so very important, as to render it convenient here to mention them distinctly. Iron ore is also very abundant in this group, which, from the immediate vicinity of the fuel and the limestone, employed as a flux, affords a site to our great works for this metal, and the principal station of our manufacturing industry. The lower portion of the series is characterised by the greater abundance of sandstone and limestone, the fossils being, as in the preceding group, principally marine; but some remains mark the beds containing them to have been deposited where fresh waters must have mingled, as in estuaries, or perhaps have exclusively prevailed. In the upper beds, sandstone, shale, coal,

* The transition order of strata, below the carboniferous, has been, by the recent discoveries of Professor Sedgwick and Mr. Murchison, subdivided into the cambrian and silurian groups; but the distinctions, principally founded on minute specific differences in the organic remains, neither require nor admit of explanation in so short a sketch.

and ironstone prevail. The remains here are almost exclusively vegetables, principally vascular cryptogomiae, among which are large tree ferns, allied to those which still exist in torrid and moist climates, such as tropical islands. Some coniferæ are also found. The coal appears to have originated entirely as a mineralized product, derived from these vegetable substances.

C. *The rocks to which the term secondary is more strictly confined in ordinary geological nomenclature, here commence; these may be again subdivided into three principal groups; the lowest consists of a central mass of red and variegated sandstone, based by a limestone containing magnesia, and surmounted by another calcareous bed, wanting in this island, but greatly developed on the continent. Few organic remains are found in the sandstone; but it is one great repository of rock, salt, and gypsum; and in the subjacent magnesian limestone we find the first traces of large fossil reptiles of the saurian order, which have not yet been detected in any earlier formation: fossil fishes are also very abundant in certain strata of this series.*

D. A great series of oolitic limestones, based upon and alternating with thick argillaceous deposits; the lowest of these clays is well known as the lias formation; the lias is characterized by the great abundance of extinct monsters of the saurian order; some intermediate between a lizard and a fish, others between a lizard and a bird, others between a lizard and a tortoise, with a neck twice as long and many jointed as that of the swan; different species of these families prevail through the whole oolitic series, mixed with abundant shells, often of extinct families, such as the very numerous species of the cornua ammonis.*

E. The cretaceous group, consisting in its lower portion of different arenaceous beds, supporting very thick deposits of chalk, of which the upper beds abound, with nodules of flint. Very few saurians of the oolitic group have yet been found in the cretaceous group, but many of the same families of testacea occur. *Here the Secondary order of formations in geological nomenclature terminates.*

F. *The Tertiary order.* Here the deposits are generally of a more earthy character, though well consolidated rocks are occasionally interposed; the fossil fauna and flora here assume a much nearer resemblance to still existing types, and this resemblance increases as we ascend the series: in the lowest group $\tau\delta\theta$ of the fossil species of testacea are identical with recent species; in the

* Between the oolitic and cretaceous group in the Weald of Kent and Sussex, are interposed beds of sand and coarse limestone, apparently of lacustrine formation; these are characterized by a peculiar species of saurian, having the teeth of the iguana but of much larger dimensions; this formation seemed of too local a character to require notice in the text, but we shall have frequent occasion to refer to its fossils.

middle group the proportion is $\frac{1}{100}$, in the upper $\frac{5}{100}$; a similar approximation is found in the forms of the fishes and vegetables here preserved. These deposits are partly characterized by sea-shells, partly by fresh water shells; and these alternate, so as to indicate a great oscillation in the level of the surface with reference to the oceanic level; the shells are beautifully preserved, and might almost be mistaken for recent specimens, only that they have generally lost their colour: univalves are particularly abundant. Land mammalia make almost their first appearance in the tertiary period. The oolitic, indeed, affords, as we shall shortly see, one species allied to didelphys: but these marsupial races may justly be considered as belonging to a distinct and inferior order of terrestrial quadrupeds, such as we might, from general analogies, have expected to make their appearance first; in the lower tertiaries the land mammalia belong to extinct genera, Anoplotheria, Palæotheria, &c.; in the upper tertiaries, we find known actual genera, such as the elephant, rhinoceros, &c. but still extinct species.

III. Having thus enumerated a general list of the successive geological formations and their fossils, which will be found very necessary for our future references, we may add a few remarks on the violent convulsions they appear to have undergone. From the above enumeration, it is self-evident, that all the beds except the primitive substrata, have been deposited as loose mud, and for the most part beneath the ocean. How then are we to account for their present exposure on the general surface of our continents, and often at many thousand feet of elevation above the sea level? We must either suppose the waters of the ocean to have diminished, or the strata once deposited beneath them to have been displaced by some mechanical force effecting a relative change of level between these deposits and their parent waves. Now, in favour of the former hypothesis there is no probable argument; but if we examine the position of the strata, we observe, everywhere, the clearest evidence of their having suffered mechanical displacement; they scarcely ever retain that exact horizontality under which the laws of gravitation must require such deposits to have taken place, but are always arranged in planes more or less inclined, and often at a very considerable angle; frequently, also, they are broken, shattered, and contorted; so that they may be fitly compared to a field of ice in the arctic seas, which has been broken up by the swell of a violent storm, and its masses huddled and packed together in wild confusion. These disturbances especially prevail in the vicinity of hilly and elevated regions. If we proceed to inquire what disturbing force has produced these remarkable effects, the phenomena them-

selves present us with sufficient indications to enable us to return a very satisfactory answer. Volcanic forces obviously present the only physical agents with which we are acquainted, capable of producing effects at all analogous; therefore, from the age of Strabo (who especially refers to the elevation of the promontory of Methone, in Argolis), these have been referred to, as affording the only satisfactory solution for the emersion of all those vast portions of our actual continents, which are evidently of submarine formation; and, in confirmation of this view, we find every division of the strata broken across in very many places by masses of rock, which have evidently been injected, and which are clearly referred by identity of mineral composition, and by all their general relations, to volcanic products; these graduate on the one hand into recent lavas, and on the other into the ancient granites. In recent and historical periods, we are acquainted with analogous effects of the volcanic forces, in the elevation of Monte Nuovo—of the American Jurillo, and of more than one island in the Mediterranean, and in the vicinity of the Azores; and we have records of the elevation of very extensive tracts of the coasts of Chili, by the two most recent earthquakes. In earlier periods, while the crust of the earth, whose thickness must now oppose so considerable a resistance to these subterranean forces, was only in an incipient stage of formation, every principle of mechanical philosophy must necessarily lead us to suppose that their effects must have been far more violent. We now experience only the expiring efforts of the giant Typhæus, crushed beneath the imposed weight of mountain masses. With the agency of fire, thus developed in volcanic elevations of the strata, the destructive action of the most powerful currents of water will appear, from the very simplest consideration of the conditions, to have been necessarily combined. While such vast masses were so violently torn up from the bed of the ocean, and upraised above its level, the agitation thus produced in the circumambient fluid must necessarily have precipitated stupendous diluvial waves, capable of effecting the most tremendous ravages, over the surface of the tracts in the act of emergence. Thus we find the inequalities of surface, which give character and variety to our continents, to have resulted from a double series of causes; partly from the original elevation of the strata, and partly from the destructive and excavating effects of violent currents of water, which have abraded and worn them into hollows, and scattered their worn fragments, in the form of gravelly shingle, over the more level tracts. These diluvial agencies appear to have prevailed very extensively during the most recent epochs to which geology directs our attention, even after the formation of the

newest tertiary strata, since all these are excavated in the manner above described, and have vast accumulations of such diluvial gravel drifted into their hollows. This gravel contains remains of the same extinct species of elephant, rhinoceros, and hyæna, which we have before noticed, as occurring in the uppermost tertiary deposits. At first, it was natural for geologists to refer these comparatively recent diluvial phenomena to that great historical deluge to which the traditions of most nations have preserved distinct allusions, while the Sacred Writings present us with an authoritative record of the particulars. But, subsequently, many philosophers have inclined, from all their circumstances, rather to refer the geological phenomena in question to distinct and local deluges than to one general deluge; and theologians have insisted, that the Scriptural narrative appears to indicate a more quiet rise and subsidence of the floods than would account for the violent effects referred to. We do not wish positively to concur with either party; but we fully agree in the prudence of not weakening the moral evidence on which we rely as the support of our reception of the sacred history, by attempting to bolster it up by physical arguments, at all events uncertain, and very possibly, treacherous. We will here only observe then, that, at all events, these geological evidences of very similar convulsions, must effectually remove from the Scriptural narrative all the antecedent improbability arising from the suspicion of its involving any thing like a physical impossibility.

Such are the geological conclusions which all who have studied the subject, while differing on many theoretical points, are generally agreed in considering as at present firmly established. When so much has been ascertained, it is surely absurd to argue, as has been sometimes done, that no sound conclusions can as yet be built on geological premises. We entirely agree with the professor, "admitting that we have yet much to learn, we contend that much sound knowledge has been already acquired, and we protest against the rejection of established parts because the whole is not yet made perfect." To take the parallel case of astronomy, will any one maintain that no sound conclusions as to the harmony of the system of the universe could have been deduced from the Keplerian laws, before the Newtonian theory of universal gravitation was fully completed, which in fact it was not till the time of Laplace; or, at present, may we not justly reason on Bode's remarkable law as to the distances of the planets, because we are still entirely ignorant of any physical cause on which it can be supposed to depend?

All those geological phenomena, which it has thus taken us some

pages to describe, are far more efficiently presented to the eye in a most instructive folding sectional plate which introduces the very splendid and unrivalled series of graphic illustrations, which, with their descriptions, fill the whole second volume of the professor's treatise.* In this plate we have a full exhibition of the fundamental primitive rocks, traversed by metallic veins, and intersected by granitic, porphyritic, and basaltic dykes. In the great basins lying between the elevations of the primary rocks, we have distinctly represented to us all the members of the superincumbent series of transition, carboniferous, secondary, and tertiary deposits, as above described; while over each are groups of very spirited figures of plants and animals, containing striking restorations of all the most characteristic varieties of organic remains, which form a source of such inexhaustible interest in the history of these deposits; all the disturbances and dislocations affecting the strata are clearly shown; the veins of ignigenous rocks and all their remarkable phenomena are portrayed, and the relations of recent volcanos are introduced; nor are the excavations of the surface by diluvial currents and accumulations of gravel less distinctly marked. It is very little to say, that a careful inspection of this single plate will teach geology far more effectually than the meagre notices which we are able to give—it is really an excellent substitute for very complete treatises. Children, when asked if they have read the books given them, will often reply, that *they have read the pictures*; and, in geology, adults might satisfactorily adopt a similar answer; here a faithful portrait is superior to whole pages of description, and the Horatian maxim is emphatically true.

* We find more than 700 figures, mostly engraved, and very carefully executed, of organic remains. This apparatus of plates, both accounts in great measure for the delay of the publication, and presents us with an incidental advantage arising from that very delay. In the execution of these illustrations, the professor himself had first to instruct the draughtsmen employed, in the necessity of accurately representing minutiae of detail, of the importance of which they could not be themselves aware; and again, from the same motives, to repeat the same lessons to the engravers to secure fidelity in their copies. The advantage arising from the publication at this late period, arises from the experience of the sale of the former treatise having justified the publication at once of an edition of 5,000 copies. This large impression reduces the additional charge imposed on each copy by these magnificent illustrations, exclusive of the paper and printing, to only two shillings; in a limited edition of only 500 copies, this would necessarily have amounted to a surcharge of one pound on each. The terms of Lord Bridgewater's bequest were such as to give every facility to these liberal arrangements.

We may also here notice a very ingenious arrangement adopted by the author in the distribution of his materials; all those portions of his anatomical details, which are most difficult for the common reader to apprehend, and which, therefore, most require the assistance of plates, are referred to the description of those plates; the text presents the most general and easy views, and may therefore be read with little interruption or embarrassment; and details of an intermediate character are usually subjoined as notes.

“ Segniùs irritant animos demissa per aures,
Quàm quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus.”

Having thus sketched the general phenomena of the disposition of the masses constituting the earth's crust, we shall now proceed to the great subject proposed by the founder of these treatises, namely, the indications of design afforded by the beneficial results consequent on this disposition, and all the accompanying conditions. In the first place, then, we may consider the disposition of the great basins of the sea and the elevated lands. It is evident how greatly the climate, temperature, and all other meteorological conditions of the various countries depend on this disposition, and the proportion of the oceanic and terrestrial surfaces. We perceive how admirably, in the actual state of things, all these conditions are adjusted to the constitution of the vegetable and animal races occupying the different districts,—a system of adjusted relations may therefore here be distinctly recognized; yet this disposition appears to have been the result of violent convulsions;—does it not therefore follow, that these convulsions must have been overruled by a superintending intelligence? 2dly. The minor inequalities which diversify the earth's surface into all the fair varieties of hill and valley, are not merely admirable for picturesque beauty, but absolutely essential to afford a regular system of water-courses to distribute fertility over the lands: the whole structure of the earth's surface accommodates it for all the purposes of a very perfect hydraulic machine; the waters raised in clouds by evaporation from the circumambient seas are collected, condensed, and precipitated in showers on the summits of the inland hills, thence continuous and nicely adjusted systems of ramifying and inosculating valleys convey them through gradually expanding channels, pursuing uniformly descending planes, till they at length form tidal rivers, and are finally reabsorbed in their parent ocean. Thus an adequate irrigation is provided for the maintenance of the fertility necessary to the existence of any animal life; and, as a secondary object, the most valuable channels are opened to the intercourse and traffic of man. Here, again, all the conditions of this provision have been the results of violent convulsions, partly of the elevation, and partly of the excavation of the surface by diluvial currents. Again,* from the alternation of porous strata, such as sand, and strata impervious to and therefore retentive of water, such as clay, and the disposition of these strata, not horizontally but inclined, and arranged in basin-shaped curves, the rain falling on the outcrop, as it is called, of a sandy stratum, penetrates its

* The doctrine of Artesian wells, as they are called, and the whole subject of the hydraulic provisions of the earth's crust, are fully discussed by Professor Buckland in the 22d chapter.

whole mass, and is retained between the superincumbent and subjacent clays, thus supplying a reservoir for all the wells of the vicinity. Now, had the strata constituting the earth's crust, formed only a system of horizontal and concentric laminæ, the natural arrangement which would have resulted from their mode of deposition, had not disturbing and elevating forces interfered, this method of supply would have been obviously impossible.

3dly. As Dr. Buckland has well observed, "we shall form a better estimate of the utility of the complex disposition of the materials of the earth, which has resulted from the operation of all these mighty conflicting forces, if we consider the inconveniences that might have attended other arrangements more simple than those which actually exist. Had the earth's surface presented only one unvaried mass of granite or lava; or had its nucleus been surrounded by entire concentric coverings of stratified rocks, like the coats of an onion, a single stratum only would have been accessible to its inhabitants, and the varied intermixtures of limestone, clay, and sandstone, which, under the actual disposition, are so advantageous to the fertility, beauty, and habitability of the globe, would have had no place." The same arguments are extended to the accessibility of the inestimably precious treasures of mineral salt, coal, and the metallic ores, as entirely depending on the elevated and inclined arrangement of the strata, and we may add, that the dislocations or faults which are so prevalent in the carboniferous strata, necessarily tend to keep the same beds much longer within reach than they would otherwise have remained; and by dividing the coal fields into insulated portions, cut off from the rest by dykes impervious to water, are found greatly to facilitate the drainage. These strata are still further laid open to our reach by their exposure along the sides of valleys of excavation.* We have before noticed the beneficial association of coal, iron, and limestone, in the same districts, and we may add that iron, as it is by far the most useful, so also is it the most extensively diffused of metals. Lastly, it will be sufficient, simply to mention the importance of a soil fitted for agricultural purposes; it is self-evident how entirely this must depend upon the composition and due intermixture of the superficial strata.

The additions thus afforded to our evidences of final causes, may, indeed, be in some respects less cogent than those derived from such sciences as anatomy and physiology, where the relations presented to us are more simple, direct, and obvious; yet, in two respects, they appear to extend our inferences still further

* We would especially refer to the 19th, 20th, and 21st chapters of the treatise, as containing a very full and masterly development of these arguments.

than the instances which can be deduced from any other science. In the first place, when we reflect that all this beneficial order has originated amidst, and indeed resulted from, the convulsive operation of the most furious energies of nature, we are surely led to look up with a deeper conviction to the interference of a controlling and intelligent cause, overruling those disturbing and destructive forces to the production of a system so admirably adjusted in all its parts to fulfil manifest purposes of wisdom and benevolence. And still further, (and this is in fact by far the most important branch of the whole subject,) geological evidence enables us to lay far more securely the very foundation stone of the whole theological argument from final causes; for geology alone, of the physical sciences, presents us with a direct refutation of the idea adopted originally by Aristotle, and subsequently repeated by many writers with a Pantheistic application, that the whole system of the universe presented us with nothing but an infinite succession, without any trace of a first term. In direct contradiction to every theory of this kind, geology presents to our actual observation the monuments of a period antecedent to the very origin of animal life on our planet; and thus demonstrates an original act of creation, and therefore a creator; it also shows us, that the forms of animal life were so essentially varied at different eras, that we must admit repeated and successive exertions of the same creative energy.

We are by this last argument suitably led to the second, and, perhaps, most important division of the professor's treatise—the evidences of design evinced by the structure of those very numerous former races of organic beings, “of whose creation and destruction,” as it is well observed, “we should have remained alike ignorant, had it not been for the discoveries of modern geological science.” In our very first paragraphs we have already expressed our view of the great value of the present work, as supplying that material desideratum, a popular, yet masterly, view of all the general results of recent discoveries in Palæontology, as it is called, up to the latest period—and, indeed, extending previous discoveries by a mass of original observation, little perhaps to have been expected in an essay of the kind before us. Rapid as our survey must be, we shall endeavour to point out the most material of these new facts.

Essential as have been the modifications introduced at successive geological periods, still a perfect uniformity has ever pervaded the general design sufficiently illustrative of the unity of the great designer.

These modifications have undoubtedly depended on the principle of an exact adaptation at every successive period of the constitution of the animal and vegetable species to the then pre-

vailing circumstances of the temperature, and other conditions of our planet. As our knowledge of these conditions is, however, necessarily very imperfect, our views of the above relations must be to a considerable degree obscure—although the general adaptation of almost all the fossil species to a warmer temperature than that now prevailing in the countries where they are discovered, clearly indicates that such relations were maintained. The relations, however, which are most directly brought under our cognizance, are found in the proportions of the carnivorous races destined at each period to regulate the balance of the animal population, and the subsistence provided; and thus to maintain what the professor calls, by an expressive term borrowed from former writers, the *police of nature*. The professor has very ably shown by an extension of the Paleyan argument, that the law of mortality being assumed, such provisions cannot be considered at all inconsistent with the Divine benevolence—but tend to increase the aggregate of animal enjoyment, and diminish that of pain. It is surely a false sensibility which can hesitate to assent to the Psalmist's declaration, that "the Lions roaring after their prey, do seek their meat from God." It is truly curious, and were it not supported by the most demonstrative evidence, would appear almost incredible, that we should be able thus to pronounce as to the species of nutriment consumed by animals, whose whole families have perished from the things that be, ages before the existence of our own race.

The mutual relations of the several parts of the same animal frame are also as perfectly manifest in fossil, as in recent skeletons; the instrument is often so perfect that its very remains are sufficient to indicate by a careful examination of their adaptations, the exact work imposed on the extinct animal for its subsistence.

We shall be able to do little more, in so brief a sketch, than indicate the general heads of the professor's descriptions—and indeed the detail would be very imperfectly intelligible without his plates. He does not profess to give a complete history of all the known organic remains, (though very extensive lists of those characteristic of the principal formations are inserted,) but only to select the most prominent and important examples. These he describes, following the usual divisions of the animal kingdom, and therefore begins with the class mammalia. The examples selected from this class* are the *Dinotherium* and *Megatherium*,

* There are, however, complete lists of the other mammalia of the tertiary period—the first epoch of the appearance of this class of quadrupeds, with the exception already stated of the single specimen of the inferior family of marsupials found in the Stonesfieldoolite. An interesting plate, copied from Cuvier, is given of the extinct pachydermata which once inhabited the environs of Paris while yet a series of lakes, shaded by forests of palms.

the most remarkable of all for size and unexampled peculiarities of animal construction.

The *dinotherium* was the largest of terrestrial mammalia, it was most nearly allied to the family of tapirs, but deviates from them and every other quadruped, in enormous tusks curved downwards from the lower jaw, like those in the upper jaw of the walrus. Like the existing tapirs it must have been aquatic, inhabiting fresh water lakes; for it is mechanically impossible that a lower jaw four feet long, loaded with these heavy tusks, could have been supported without extreme inconvenience, unless their weight were sustained in water. We may suppose these tusks to have been employed in grubbing up large roots from the bottom, a work for which they are admirably calculated, and by being hooked on the banks may have sustained the nostrils of the animal for respiration during sleep, while the body floated at ease; they would have assisted also in dragging the creature out of the water, and supplied formidable instruments of defence. These remains occur in the most recent tertiary deposits of Hesse Damstadt, and that district at the time appears to have abounded in large lakes.

The *megatherium* was a colossal animal, exceeding the largest rhinoceros, nearly allied in many particulars to the sloth, but invested with a bony armour like the armadillo. It presents, like the whole sloth tribe, many peculiarities, and seeming deformities of structure; these were much misunderstood, and misrepresented as imperfections of design, until the acumen and general knowledge of the habits of animals of the present author have effectually vindicated this part of creation from the flippant remarks of Buffon—who, we much regret to add, had been in this one instance followed even by Cuvier.* These writers conceived that the recent *bradypus*, altogether unsuited from the structure of its extremities, for locomotion on the ground, was a mere abortion of nature, formed only for misery—but the ground is not the pro-

It is unnecessary to add that the history of the extinct species of elephant, rhinoceros, hyæna, &c. found in the diluvial gravel and caves owes very much indeed to the researches of the present author, who may be considered as having first reduced the previous loose observations on these deposits to a regular and scientific system.

* Cuvier's own great laws, however, of the co-existence and co-ordinate relations of every part of the animal frame, the great instrument of his discoveries, afford an accession quite as important to the argument from design as does in astronomy Laplace's demonstration of the provision securing the stability of our system. It is remarkable that these very important generalizations appear to have been forced on the mind of Cuvier by his efforts to class the fossil mammalia of the basin of Paris while he yet possessed only a few teeth and scattered bone—so often does the very poverty of the materials afforded to scientific research, call forth the most powerful intellectual resources. He soon found himself able to pronounce with certainty on the exact place and relation in the animal kingdom of these remains, and every conjecture was confirmed by the subsequent discovery of more perfect specimens. The introduction of these laws has at once raised comparative anatomy to the rank of an exact science.

per sphere of the animal; it is destined to live entirely on trees, and to feed on their leaves; and the very peculiarities so disadvantageous on the ground are here equally advantageous. In this, as in all the works of the Creator when the true relations are known, the adaptation is found perfect; the instrument is always exactly adjusted to the required function. Thus also the megatherium is in all its parts perfectly fitted for procuring the kind of subsistence which a careful investigation of its teeth and claws indicates as its proper food. We have never met with any chain of anatomical deduction more striking and satisfactory than that with which our author here presents us—alone it would confer on him a claim to the highest distinction for very unusual powers of philosophical penetration. We shall endeavour briefly to state the leading particulars. The form of the muzzle renders it probable that the megatherium was provided with a snout sufficiently elongated to pick up roots from the ground. The teeth are exactly calculated for the mastication of such roots. Plates of enamel, passing twice across the grinding surfaces, form two projecting cutting edges, and the opposite teeth are so disposed that these harder projections of the upper locked into the depressions in the softer portions of the lower; hence the act of mastication formed, and perpetually maintained, a series of wedges applied to each other like the alternate ridges on the rollers of a crushing-mill. Many other particulars are described, which show these teeth to have possessed that property which is the perfection of all machinery, that of maintaining itself perpetually in perfect order by the act of performing its work. The forms of the bones of the anterior extremity, and all the connected parts, show that these were not designed principally for purposes of locomotion or support (which latter function was transferred to the colossal hinder extremities); but must have possessed a powerful rotatory motion, adapting them to the action of digging out of the ground, for which also the enormous length of the fore foot, and its toes armed with long and powerful claws set obliquely to the ground, like those of the mole, for the same purpose, presented most efficient instruments. The hinder extremities are truly colossal, the femur being three times the thickness of that of the elephant; they are adapted for support rather than locomotion, and in many peculiarities resemble those of the armadillo and chlamyphorus, both animals invested like this with a bony armour, and employed in digging for food. The enormous heel-bone would have given a firm bearing, whilst the very powerful claws attached to the hind toes were fixed like grappling-irons in the ground. The animal probably rested on three feet, and employed its fourth in digging out the tuberosc roots, with which the American regions,

in the diluvial deposits of which it is found, abound. It possessed a thick coat of bony armour; at once a defence against the attacks of enemies, and against the annoyance of the dust raised in its digging; and a tail more enormous than that of any other of the mammalia afforded both a formidable weapon, and, by the mode of its attachment to the sacral extremity of the spine, a support to its covering of mail. The Professor's account thus concludes: "Thus heavily constructed and ponderously accoutred, in all its movements, it must have been necessarily slow; but what need of rapid locomotion to an animal whose occupation of digging roots for food was almost stationary? and what need of speed of flight from foes to this leviathan of the Pampas, whose giant carcase was encased in an impenetrable cuirass, and who by a single pat of his paw or lash of his tail, could in an instant have demolished the cougar or the crocodile."

The fossil reptiles of the saurian class are next considered. This class first appears in the limestone beneath the new red sandstone, and continues in abundance through the whole oolitic period, and partially in the cretaceous and tertiary rocks, being at present represented by crocodiles, monitors, &c. The lias, however, appears to present the most remarkable repository, and the most important species have been very completely restored to us by English geologists, who were supplied by the spirit and skill of Mary Anning, a vendor of fossils from the lias cliffs of Lyme Regis, not alone with disjointed bones, but with slabs containing entire skeletons. These saurians, often more than thirty feet in length, appear to have braved the waves of former oceans, and therefore to have had their structure suitably modified. Thus the genus *ichthyosaurus* (or fish lizard) of which we are acquainted with at least five species, while its head is distinctly, by all the peculiarities of its osteology, referred to the lizard type, has yet the form of its muzzle more like that of the porpoise, and its vertebral column agrees with that of fish (properly so called) in having the articulating surfaces deeply excavated to admit interposed bags of elastic gelatinous substance, to permit its flexibility, and render it an instrument of locomotion, by its being bent in many curves, and then suddenly extended in a straight line. Its extremities form an intermediate step between the paddles of turtles and the fins of fishes, and the whole structure of the bones of the head is calculated to unite buoyancy with strength; by the application, as in fishes, of thin laminae of bone, whose fibres, on the principle of diagonal bracings, run in oblique directions. The immense eyes of this animal had a peculiar character given them by the substitution of a very conspicuous circle of bony plates, in the place of the cornea. This also may be observed in

the eyes of other reptiles, and of some birds, especially the owl. Previous geologists had illustrated very completely the whole osteology of this monster of the ancient deep, even to its mode of replacing its teeth—but here, as in almost every other branch, the discoveries of our present author have added very materially to our information, by resolutely pursuing obscure investigations with which none but himself probably would have thought of grappling. Among these remains were often found irregular vermiform, and partially turbinated masses, full of fragments of bones, scales of fish, &c. These the Professor conjectured to have been the remains of the fæces of these animals, containing undigested bony fragments; he therefore named them coprolites. This conjecture was fully confirmed by finding the same masses in their original situation within the ribs of entire skeletons. They are often so perfect as to indicate not only the food of the animals, but also the dimensions, form and structure of their stomach and intestinal canal; the stomach hence appears to have been of amazing capacity, and the small intestines spirally arranged like the interior of an Archimedes' screw, just as in the most voracious of our modern fishes, *e. g.* the shark and dog-fish. The ichthyosaurus must therefore, to borrow the Professor's favourite metaphor, have formed in ancient times a most efficient agent in the police of nature. Coprolites derived from the stomachs of smaller fish are likewise often found.*

The plesiosaurus, an animal of which the length must, like that of the ichthyosaurus, have varied from 30 to less than 10 feet, is next described. Its paddles closely resemble those of the turtle, as would its whole structure, did we divest the latter of its shield. Like some turtles it has a small head and long neck; but in this last particular it is very remarkable, for while all other quadrupeds have a very limited number of joints in the neck, (mammalia only seven, and reptiles not above ten,) the plesiosaurus almost doubles the number in the arched neck of the swan, having nearly 40 cervical vertebræ. This made Cuvier consider it as the most heteroclite of fossil monsters—the species in which this particular is most remarkable, is hence called *dolichodeirus*. Another, distinguished by a somewhat larger head, is denominated *macrocephalus*. From its structure we may infer that, like the turtle, it was aquatic, but perhaps occasionally visited the shore, as its whole form must have been ill-accommodated to cut through the waves like the ichthyosaurus. It probably swam on

* The Professor has also detected the integuments of this extinct monster and described them, as we believe for the first time, in the present work. He has figured the rete mucosum, the true skin, and epidermis. The description will be found among the explanations of the plates—p. 22, vol. ii.

or near the surface, arching its long neck like the swan, and occasionally darted it down at the smaller fish within its reach. The flexibility of this organ, by the suddenness and agility imparted to its movements, would compensate for the small size and feeble power of its jaws; and as it could lurk in shoal water along the coast, concealed among the seaweed, while by means of this long neck it raised its nostrils to the surface for respiration, it may thus have found a safe retreat from dangerous enemies.

The preceding species appear to have become extinct before the termination of the cretaceous deposits; but in the upper beds of these at Maestricht we find that the vacancy thus created in the carnivorous police was filled by a large saurian nearly allied to the monitor, but of five times greater size than any recent species in that family, which scarcely exceed five feet. This animal is named, from the locality where first discovered, *Mosa-saurus*. Dr. Buckland here observes, "The most skilful anatomists would be at a loss to devise a series of modifications by which a monitor could be enlarged to the length and bulk of a grampus, and at the same time be fitted to move with strength and rapidity through the waters of the sea; yet in the fossil before us, we shall find the generic character of a monitor maintained throughout the whole skeleton, with such deviations only as tended to fit the animal for its marine existence." All the details establishing these points are fully given in the work; but we must confine ourselves to the general results.

In these early periods, the saurian or lizard family appears to have been one of the most numerous and important of the natural orders, and had representatives not only in the ocean, but in the air, and on the earth. As we have already had a fish lizard subjected to our notice, so our attention is next called to a flying lizard, named the pterodactyle, or wing-finger, from having the series of digital phalanges corresponding to the last finger elongated so as to support a membranous wing, while the four others are armed with claws, as instruments probably of climbing or suspension among the branches of trees. In the bat, to which this structure is most analogous, four of the fingers are thus elongated to support the wing, and one only terminates in a claw. The whole osteology closely adheres to the lizard tribe, but is so modified as to have been admirably adjusted to live and move in a new medium. Dr. Buckland has largely extracted from Cuvier's beautiful analysis of its structure; that philosopher considers it as the most extraordinary and unlike any thing that now exists of all fossil animals. Dr. Buckland, who first detected them in this country in the lias of Lyme, and oolite of Stonesfield, (they had been previously discovered at Aichstadt, and at

Solenhofen in Germany,) believes they had the power of swimming as well as flight, and says that, "like Milton's fiend, the creature amidst the confusion of a yet turbulent planet,

"O'er bog, or steep, through strait, or dense, or rare,
With head, hands, wings, or feet, pursues his way,
And swims, or sinks, or wades, or creeps, or flies."

We have again to regret that we have no room to pursue the osteological detail, which is deeply interesting. Geology has already presented us with eight species of this very singular genus.

We must still more briefly mention those enormous ancient terrestrial saurians, the megalosaurus and iguanodon; the former genus, established by the discoveries of Dr. Buckland himself at Stonesfield in the oolite, has been since also found by Mr. Mantell in the freshwater deposits of the Weald of Kent and Sussex, which intervene between the oolite and subcretaceous sand. The megalosaurus, as its name imports, must have been an enormous reptile, measuring from 40 to 50 feet in length, and partaking of the structure of the crocodile and monitor. It was carnivorous, and is especially admired as a most efficient member of his animal police by Dr. Buckland, because its teeth were calculated to put its victims very speedily out of their pain.

The iguanodon is a discovery of Mr. Mantell, in the Wealden formation, before noticed. It is even larger than the megalosaurus, and must have had *more than a giant's strength*, but was not, like all the former saurians, "*tyrannous enough to use it as a giant*." If any of our readers should have been sentimental enough to feel shocked at the sanguinary character of our very efficient *police*, as hitherto described, they will be relieved to find that our new monster is, in truth, "*a very delicate monster*," an innocent herbivorous reptile. Its teeth, almost identical with those of the recent iguana, (whence its name,) completely prove this—an identity very remarkable, when we consider the diminutive size of the modern animal, scarcely exceeding five feet, as contrasted with the fossil analogue, at least twelve times that size. How might a saurian "*laudator temporis acti*" mourn over the degeneracy of iguanas, as iguanas are now! The fossil, like the recent iguana, appears to have combined with these teeth, a nasal horn, and the concurrence of these remarkable peculiarities, in both types, affords a good example of Cuvier's laws of co-existence.

The Hylæosaurus, (or, Lizard of the Forest or Weald,) a creature about twenty-five feet long, was found in the same locality. The most remarkable peculiarity consists in a series of long flat pointed bones, which seems to have formed a dermal fringe, like the horny spines on the back of the modern iguana.

This account of fossil saurians, the slightest glance at which must at once impress every reader with a full sense of the value and extent of the additions which geology has made to zoology, is concluded by an account of the fossil amphibious saurians allied to crocodiles. Recent crocodiles are divided into two subgenera: the first, with elongated and slender snouts, or gavials; the second, with broad and short snouts, including the crocodiles, properly so called, and alligators. Several species, closely allied to the first type, have been found in the lias and oolitic series. Geoffrey St. Hilaire has formed two new genera for their reception—*teleosaurus* and *steneosaurus*; but it has always appeared to us that this step was unjustifiable, and that the differences from the recent gavials were much rather specific than generic. Crocodiles of the broad-snouted family have been found in the tertiary strata.

The family of tortoises, *testudinata*, or *chelonina*, presents us, in a fossil state, with several species of all its divisions. Marine turtles are found in several formations, from the muschelkalk below the lias, to the tertiary series; the fresh water genera, *trionyx* and *emys*, in the lacustrine deposits of the Kentish Weald, below the cretaceous group, and in the tertiary fluviatile beds. The bones of land tortoises have not yet been found in any more ancient strata than the most recent of these last, though we shall soon see reason to believe they have existed much earlier. The remains of this family are, perhaps, not very interesting in themselves, but, nevertheless, one of the geological circumstances connected with it, is among the most singular and striking discoveries recorded by that science. It is well known that the new red sandstone is remarkably destitute of organic remains. Some circumstances, not yet understood, connected with its formation, appear to have been altogether unfavorable to the preservation of these relics; yet the animals of that period, though they have not left their skeletons to our examination, have indelibly impressed their footsteps (we speak literally) on the strata in question, while they still formed shelves of loose sand about to assume a more consolidated form, and probably occupied the edges of the shores of ancient seas. Dr. Duncan first published, in *Transactions of the Royal Society, Edinburgh*, 1828, his discovery of these ancient footmarks, observed in slabs of new red sandstone, in Dumfriesshire. These ancient vestiges are probably to be referred to animals of the family *testudinata*, and some very nearly resemble the footprints of the *testudo Græca*. Similar impressions have been subsequently discovered in Germany. The fact of the preservation, through so many ages, of the slight tracks of these insignificant reptiles across the sand, is quite sufficiently remarkable in itself, even without being heightened by the con-

trast, so eloquently drawn by the professor, with the disappearance of every trace of the march of the millions led by Sesostris and Xerxes to the subversion of the empires of the earth.

Similar footsteps have, since the whole body of this treatise was printed, led, in America, to a very important discovery with regard to the geological history of the class of birds. In the volume of plates all the figures have been copied, and the subject is fully discussed in the annexed description.

The class of aves is even yet that to which geology has made the most unimportant additions; indeed, it can scarcely be said to have made any. No bones, decidedly belonging to birds, have been found in any strata earlier than the freshwater deposits of the Weald, (between the oolitic and cretaceous groups,) and neither these remains, nor those of the same class in the tertiary strata, have presented any interesting novelties in ornithology. This class, however, is now shown to have existed at a much earlier geological period than those above mentioned, for tracks, obviously imprinted by the feet of birds, have been observed in laminated flagstones of the new red sandstone formation, and described by Professor Hitchcock, in the *American Journal of Science and the Arts*, Jan. 1836. The footsteps most nearly resemble those of grallæ or waders. The most remarkable among them are those of a gigantic bird, twice the size of an ostrich, whose feet measured fifteen inches, exclusive of the largest claw, which measured two inches; the distance of its steps varied from four to six feet; the latter was probably the longest step of this gigantic bird, while running. These ancient birds, therefore, must have exceeded the largest of the feathered inhabitants of the present world, and been rather adapted for wading and running than flight. There is another species almost equally large and with equally distant steps, and five smaller species. Professor Hitchcock calls these footsteps ornithichnites.

Having thus cast a glance, far too rapid, over some of the most striking additions thus restored by geology from the sepulchre of ages to the history of mammalogy and erpetology, together with the corresponding, though fainter, indications with respect to ornithology, fossil ichthyology claims our next notice. Here the species were long known to be very numerous, and interesting from their beautiful preservation; but our whole knowledge of this branch of natural history, even as to recent species, was far too imperfect to throw any scientific light on its fossil remains. Many of them had indeed, been figured and named from their fancied resemblances, but every thing was vague to the last degree. As the monkish readers in the middle ages, if they met a Greek sentence in any author passed it over, muttering, "*Græcum*

est, non potest legi," so the candid geologist, if you asked him concerning an ichthyological relic, could only pronounce "*Piscis est, non potest intelligi.*" Cuvier, at the period of his death, was engaged in an important work on recent fish, which, it was hoped, would have been followed by the investigation of the fossil remains, and have thrown that light on a very difficult and obscure subject, which his exact and penetrating mind had uniformly diffused over every former branch of his investigations. That hope denied, with regard to him, has been realised by another. A successor well worthy to follow, even in his steps, has been found in Agassiz, who is now engaged in publishing a very splendid work on the subject. This author has placed the science of ichthyology, even as it relates to recent species, on entirely a new basis, having ascertained that the consideration of the character of the external scales of fishes affords the best method of distinguishing their great natural orders: of these he has established four, and the criterion thus assumed is especially applicable to fossil fishes, since the external scales are always the parts most perfectly preserved. Availing himself of these methods, Agassiz has already exactly determined 200 genera, and more than 850 species in fossil ichthyology. Most of the genera and all of the species form additions distinguished by marked differences from all the actually existing members of this great class of the animal kingdom. Since this great work, from its necessary expense, can be accessible to few, comparatively, we look on the very masterly and comprehensive, though concise, synopsis of these discoveries, given us in the present volumes, as one of their most valuable contributions to the extension of geological science.* This subject alone occupies more than thirty pages of the work, illustrated by nearly fifty figures. To follow the detail in a review would be manifestly impossible, especially as we should have to begin, in order to render our statements at all intelligible, by explaining the terminology of an entirely new nomenclature. We can only state a few of the most striking results in relation to geology.

The distinctions of the animal organizations belonging to successive geological epochs, and the relations of peculiar forms

* Professor Buckland has very essentially contributed to further the execution of Agassiz's great work. Through his introductions and exertions the specimens of all the principal English cabinets have been most liberally placed in the hands of this very able foreigner, and have afforded some of his most important materials, while the British Association have awarded pecuniary contributions to assist in the expenses of the publication. Dr. Buckland himself, in his last tour on the continent, was enabled to identify some very singular ichthyological remains which had puzzled even Agassiz, with the jaw-bones of the recent chimæra, of which, while examining other fishes in the hope, long disappointed, of elucidating these remains, he accidentally observed a specimen in a foreign collection.

to peculiar classes of strata, are shown to be still more exactly marked in fossil ichthyology, than even in the other branches of zoology. These remains often afford the most certain means of determining the age of doubtful formations. As in other classes also, we observe, as we come to the more recent deposits, a gradual approximation to forms more nearly resembling those actually existing; we do not, however, find any species exactly identical; but out of seventy-seven genera, in the earliest tertiary deposits at Monte Bolca, thirty-nine (exceeding half by unity) are still known, and mostly belong to the tropical seas, thus affording additional evidence of a much higher temperature than the present. In the chalk we have only five recent genera. The two great orders, indeed, which so far prevail in the actual system as to embrace three-fourths of all the known species, make their first appearance in the cretaceous group, which is thus ichthyologically more allied to the tertiary than to the secondary series of formations; the species, however, are all distinct, as is the general rule, between even the nearest geological groups. All the genera in the rocks older than the chalk are extinct, and even the very orders to which they are referred, have few living representatives. For all the detail we must again refer to the work itself. Here the reader will be especially interested with the account of the very large fishes, with lizard-like teeth, allied to the recent bony pike, different genera of which are preserved in the carboniferous and oolitic groups; also with the description of the different subfamilies of the shark-like fishes which have afforded the bony spines, armed on one side with prickles resembling hooked teeth, and all the varieties of striated palatal bones (called fossil leaches, &c.) so well known to fossilists. These last are well illustrated by the jaw of the Port Jackson shark, of which the anterior portion is set with the sharp cutting teeth of the true sharks, while the lateral portions are studded with oblong bones transversely striated and disposed as in a sort of tessellated pavement, closely resembling their arrangement in the fossil specimens. Dr. Buckland concludes this subject by insisting on the inferences deducible from the fact, that we often find in the older strata, genera of more complicated organization and higher development, than in the more recent, the course of nature here appearing to have been, if we may so speak, rather retrograde than progressive. He urges this as a strong negative argument against the hypothesis of a gradual development and transmutation of species. "In no kingdom of nature, therefore," he observes, "does it seem less possible to explain the successive changes of organization disclosed by geology, without the direct interposition of repeated acts of creation."

In fossil conchology it is well known how very large a proportion the additions derived from geology bear to the catalogue of recent species, and we need not repeat that the observations so often made under the preceding classes, as to the distinction and identification of the strata by their remains, and on the gradual approximation of the character of the organizations in the most recent deposits to still existing forms, while those of the older rocks are widely dissimilar, are equally applicable here. The shells themselves, however, are of little interest, if considered without reference to their relation to their molluscous inhabitants; and it is on some of the most interesting points connected with these relations that Dr. Buckland has thrown new and very unexpected light in the present work. The highest family of mollusca are the cephalopoda, so called from the arrangement of a series of projecting arms or feet, for they serve at once for prehension and locomotion, around a head distinguished by large eyes and terminating in a mouth armed with a powerful beak like that of a parrot. Some genera of this family are destitute of an external shell; of these the cuttle-fish or sepia is a familiar example; others inhabit chambered shells, such as the nautilus. Now although these chambered shells are among the most numerous and important genera of fossil conchology, it had been little expected that any remains of an animal of softer substance, like the naked sepia, could have been preserved in the strata, until the keen eye of Dr. Buckland detected such in the lias. It is well known that the sepia is furnished with an ink-bag, (affording the pigment named from it,) which it employs as a means of defence, discharging it when in danger, and thus confounding the pursuit of its enemies. Attached to this is a horny fibrous organ, which, from a fancied resemblance and position, is called the pen. The ink being a thick fluid abounding in carbon, has readily passed into a solid state, and thus become fossilized. Dr. Buckland, in a communication to the Geological Society in 1829, announced his having discovered some time before such fossil ink-bags, and pens attached; he sent some of the solidified ink to his friend Sir Francis Chantrey, who executed a drawing with it, and was asked by an eminent artist at what shop he had procured such excellent sepia. Similar remains have been since noticed in Germany; the engravings of them in the present work are very satisfactory. With regard to the chambered shells inhabited by other genera of cephalopoda, the discoveries of Dr. Buckland are still more interesting, and published for the first time in the present work. It had been justly concluded that these chambers constituted air-cells, which in some manner, like the air-bladder of fishes, were rendered subservient to encreasing or diminishing the buoyancy of

the animal. But the question was, how was this accomplished? It had been conjectured that the animal had the power of filling the cells alternately with air or water by means of a membranous tube called the siphunculus, penetrating through perforations in the transverse septa, and traversing all the cells;* but Dr. Buckland, by a long train of the most minute investigation and acute inference, has exposed the fallacy of this idea, and incontrovertibly established the true mode of operation; he has shown by the examination many fossil specimens, in which the siphuncular tube was preserved, that that tube had no such opening as was necessarily involved in the above hypothesis, since the mud, which, at the time of the interment of the shell, freely entered the siphuncle, never found access into the interior of the cells. Dr. Buckland, however, appears to have detected the true solution of the problem, by observing that the siphuncular tube, when traced into the body of the animal, which is lodged in the outer and larger chamber of the nautilus pompilius, is found to proceed from the pericardial cavity, wherein about an ounce of a fluid, secreted by surrounding follicles, is accumulated; by the contraction of the parietes of that cavity, the pericardial fluid may be forced into this membranous tube, expanding its portions between each septum, condensing the air in the air-cells by that expansion, and thus increasing the specific gravity of the whole. He also found, by ballasting a nautilus, six inches in diameter, with a few shot, that the additional weight above-stated, namely, about an ounce, was sufficient to cause it to sink, the siphuncle being stopped with wax so as to retain the air in the air-cells. The true mode by which the buoyancy is regulated appears thus to be satisfactorily ascertained. The transverse septa Dr. Buckland considers as provided to give strength to the outer shell, which being occupied interiorly only by air, would necessarily at great depths have been exposed to an external pressure from the incumbent column of water which might otherwise have crushed it; since a very solid and heavy shell would have been inconsistent with its object as an organ of buoyancy. This provision for most effectually *fortifying* the shells of nautili, by the disposition of transverse septa, is shown to account for the singularly contorted margin of the transverse septa, in all the numerous species of the great extinct family of ammonites. Many other singular varieties of chambered shells, also extinct, the turrilites, hamites, orthoceratites, &c. &c., are similarly examined, and in all, the mechanical structure is shown to present the most marked evidence of design.

* This was originally the theory proposed by Hook; Parkinson, and, more recently, Owen, who first fully described the animal of the nautilus, were aware that the tube of the siphunculus was impermeable to water, but failed in proposing any satisfactory solution of the problem of its mode of action.

It is truly astonishing to observe the very dissimilar modifications of form into which the same simple elements of structure are thrown in the different genera and species of chambered shells, and for the knowledge of most of these we are indebted to geological discovery. In some specimens of belemnite, Dr. Buckland has succeeded in detecting an ink-bag like that of the sepia. The animals of this genus appear therefore to have been naked cephalopods, uniting a small chambered shell (the alveolus) with a laminated sheath formed like the well-known bone of the cuttle-fish.

The abundance of ammonites and belemnites characterizes the secondary order of formations. Turrilites, hamites, and baculites distinguish the inferior strata of the chalk formation.

In the class of articulated animals, one of the earliest families is most remarkable, namely, the trilobites or Dudley fossils; these marine crustacea abound in the transition series, and the most interesting fact connected with them is for the first time communicated to the public, we believe, in the present work, namely, the discovery of specimens in which the structure of the eye is exhibited in a very high state of preservation; this structure is shown to agree with the general type of the eyes of the articulata, so well described in Dr. Roget's *Bridgewater Treatise*, consisting of a number of minute facets or lenses placed at the extremities of a congeries of conical tubes. Compared with the eyes of the most nearly allied recent crustacea, such modifications are found in each, of the general form and position of the eyes, as enabled them in every instance to command a quaquaversal range of vision. Dr. Buckland very ably reasons on the proofs of design evinced in these most ancient of optical instruments, and further argues from them, that the ocean in which these creatures swam, must have been transparent, and not, as some theorists have supposed, a chaotic muddy fluid.

In the carboniferous series, so abundant in vegetable remains, we should naturally expect to find traces of the insects which haunted these ancient forests, and here accordingly we discover insectivorous arachnidans, viz. scorpions, and the elytra of coleoptera on which they preyed. Spiders and coleopterous and neuropterous insects occur in the oolitic and tertiary series. In the latter, at Aix, very numerous insects have been discovered; these have been referred to sixty-two existing genera and to European forms.

The author's account of fossil zoology is closed with the classes of radiated animals and zoophytes; of the former class, the crinoids are the most interesting; they resemble a branching star-fish, like the comatula, mounted on a jointed stem, capable of attaching itself by a kind of root to rocks. In many species each indi-

vidual formed a most delicate skeleton, composed of several thousand ossicula, connected together by exquisitely wrought surfaces of articulation. More elaborate specimens of artificial workmanship and mechanical contrivance can scarcely be conceived. We know only two recent species, a larger pentacrinite, found in the West Indian seas, and a smaller one in our own; but geology has made us acquainted with more than twenty fossil species found in all the rock formations, but not promiscuously, peculiar species being usually characteristic of peculiar formations.

The last animal remains described in this volume are the accumulations of fossil coral, often constituting almost the whole mass of extensive rocky ranges, and exactly recalling the coral reefs that still form new islands in the Pacific Ocean.

The last article we shall now notice (from reasons of arrangement mentioned in an early part of our review)* consists of an excellent synopsis of the present state of our information concerning fossil botany—one of the latest branches of the study of organic remains which has received a full and scientific attention; and here, as almost everywhere else, we shall find the original researches of our author to have very largely contributed to his

* The concluding chapters of the volume relate to points connected with the structure and arrangement of the mineral strata, which we have already briefly noticed in what appeared to us their proper place; among them, however, are some remarks relative to our coal-mines, of so much economical importance as to deserve more especial notice. In vol. i. p. 544, the author has called the public attention to a criminal practice which has for many years prevailed near Newcastle, of burning on a fiery heap, at the pit's mouth, more than 100,000 chaldrons per annum of excellent small coal; and urges the importance to the future welfare of the nation, of legislative interference to prevent such wilful destruction of this precious fuel, the waste of which during more than a quarter of a century has been a national sacrifice, to the private interests of a few individuals, of the fundamental elements of the industry of future generations. In vol. ii. p. 104, he has also pointed out the future preservation of human life and property, which may arise from the general adoption of a system, lately begun at Newcastle, of preserving plans and records of the portions of the coal-beds that are extracted from every coal-mine in the kingdom. Such a practice will render accessible hereafter the poorer beds which are now not worth working, and also the residuary portions of the larger beds, without that dreadful risk of human life which attends all workings in ancient coal-pits, in ignorance of the extent of the coal removed by former operations in the same mine. In vol. ii. p. 104, Dr. Buckland has also announced the introduction into Europe of a Chinese method of boring for water and coal, and for ventilation of mines, which has lately been practised at Sairbrook. The advantage of this method consists in the substitution of a rope, with a cutting cylinder of iron at its lower extremity, for the tedious and costly apparatus of boring rods.

chapters, but our own space warns us to confine ourselves to little more than a dry list. Sea-weeds are found in strata of the transition series, and most of the following formations, but with very different characters in each. The oldest resemble the submarine vegetation of tropical regions; as we ascend, we find forms analogous to those of more temperate latitudes and of our present climates. Similar distinctions mark the remains of land plants; in the transition and carboniferous series all the analogies indicate extreme heat and moisture, as in our modern tropical islands; the species are all extinct, and of most of the genera, and even of the families, not more than half have any remaining representatives. On the whole, the very great majority of plants in this oldest flora, if we compare them with those of the present period, must be referred to the families which are now left in a small minority, and belong rather to the monocotyledonous or endogenous order, than the dicotyledonous. Here we find equisetaceæ, principally of an extinct genus, calamites; ferns occasionally arborescent, and nearly all belonging to the tribe polypodiaceæ; large scaly barked trees of an extinct genus, lepidodendron, allied to the recent lycopodiaceæ (a family intermediate between ferns and coniferæ); an extinct family called sigillaria, presenting large stems of soft internal texture, with a bark deeply fluted, and bearing the scars of fallen leaves, placed in perpendicular rows between the furrows, approximating in these characters to euphorbiaceæ and cactææ; these fossil stems are often fifty feet long. Another extinct family, called stigmaria, were apparently gigantic aquatic plants, floating in swamps or shallow lakes, like the modern stratiotes and isoetes; they were probably dicotyledonous, and bore some analogies to euphorbiaceæ; remains of coniferæ also occasionally occur in strata of the carboniferous order. All these are found with a very remarkable agreement (strongly contrasted with the local distinctions of recent floras) in the coal formations of most distant regions,—Europe, America, India, and Australia; and in some places they are extremely abundant. The author has given a very graphic description of a coal-mine in Bohemia, of which the roof is as it were overhung with a tangled growth of them. A scene almost identical, the grotto of plants in Ohio, is described and delineated in the American Journal of Science, October, 1835. It is now agreed by all that the coal itself is of vegetable origin; indeed by microscopical examination the vegetable texture may still be generally detected in it.

In the secondary series we find the families coniferæ and cycadeæ, the latter are a link connecting the coniferæ with ferns

and palms. It was Dr. Buckland himself who first pointed out that some very curious trunks of fossil vegetables, abundant in Portland Island, are referable to this family; he has also beautifully illustrated their microscopic structure. In the oolites also occur the remains of *pandaneæ*, a family resembling gigantic pine-apple plants, mounted on arborescent stems. Dr. Buckland is the first who has discovered fossil fruits of plants of this family, which are very singularly constructed; he minutely describes them, and assigns the name *podocarya* to this extinct genus, which, like modern *pandaneæ*, was singularly adapted to perform the office, as he phrases it, "of vegetable colonization." Growing on the sea-shore, their light fibrous drupes are wafted by the tides, and transport the elements of vegetation to the surface of coral islands at this time just emerging from the Pacific; such vegetables were therefore singularly suited to the yet nascent stages of the earth's crust. In the tertiary formations the vegetation approximates much more nearly to the existing flora of more temperate climates, and the proportion of dicotyledonous plants to monocotyledonous becomes nearly as five to one; but amidst these generic resemblances, the species are still mostly extinct. Extensive accumulations of vegetables, of the tertiary era, still preserving their woody character little changed, form beds of lignite or brown coal on the banks of the Rhine near Bonn, at Soissons, and in our own island. These are referred to the earliest period of the tertiary series; the remains of palms are also found throughout this series.

In all these changes of the fossil floras of successive periods, we perceive every analogy to indicate an accommodation to a gradually decreasing temperature. This inference does not rest on single or even few instances; for any argument from mere analogy, built on such a limited basis, would deserve little attention; but such analogies, when they are almost universal, cannot be attributed to accident. We have here therefore clear proof of intelligent design with a general unity of end, yet from time to time varying its subordinate methods, in order ever to place them in perfect accordance with the variation of external circumstances.

And here we must close our examination of a work which has excited and throughout sustained the warmest interest in our own minds while thus analytically studying it. That interest we feel we must very imperfectly have conveyed to our readers, for we have been able to present but a bare skeleton, stripping it of the muscular integuments which gave strength and grace to the original. Whoever will study the details of the original will

X warmly join in the feelings cited by the author from a friend and fellow-labourer of the same Oxford school: "To the observer actually engaged in tracing the various links that bind together the chain of organized beings, and struck at every instant by the development of the most beautiful analogies, almost every detail of comparative anatomy, however minute, acquires an interest and even a charm, since he is continually presented with fresh proofs of the great general law which Scarpa himself, one of its most able investigators, has so elegantly expressed: 'Usque adeo natura, una eadem semper atque multiplex, disparibus etiam formis effectus pares, admirabili quâdam varietatum simplicitate conciliat.'" When, as throughout these treatises, we are directed to look still higher, and to see in all these things proofs of the unity and attributes of the great designer of universal nature, we are convinced that the greatest benefit to the best discipline of the mind must result from the habit thus impressed of giving a religious association to our most interesting intellectual speculations: and this, we are persuaded, will be found to be the principal advantage arising from the application of the Duke of Bridgewater's bequest, far more than even supplying any additional force to the great argument from final causes, an argument abundantly and perhaps most effectually proved by a simple appeal to the plainest and most obvious instances. And surely it is no small advantage thus to have exhibited some of our most powerful intellects under what we may call their religious aspect. The due subordination also of all such sources of natural theology to the only authoritative revelations of the Divine will, are enforced by our author in his concluding chapter, p. 590, in two admirable quotations from the great father of inductive philosophy:—"Concludamus igitur Theologiam Sacram ex verbo et oraculis Dei, non ex lumine naturæ, aut rationis dictamine hauriri debere. Scriptum est enim cœli enarrant gloriam Dei, at nusquam scriptum est cœli enarrant voluntatem Dei."—(*De Augment. Scient.* l. ix. c. i.) "Thy creatures have been my books, but thy scriptures much more. I have sought thee in the courts, fields, and gardens, but I have found thee in thy temples."—(*Bacon's works*, vol. 4, fol. p. 487.)

ART. III.—*A History of the English Episcopacy ; from the period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity ; with Notices of the Religious Parties of the Time, and a Review of Ecclesiastical Affairs in England, from the Reformation.* By the Rev. Thomas Lathbury, M.A. London, Parker, 1836. 8vo. pp. 363.

THE author of this work has expressed, in his preface, some anxiety, lest the cause he has taken in hand should suffer from his own defect of literary skill. We conceive that he may safely dismiss his apprehensions. The book, it is true, exhibits no great power of writing. But it tells the tale, perspicuously and dispassionately, and without any symptoms of disturbance from "the fever of renown," or the still worse malady of a bitter and uncharitable spirit.

The tale, indeed, has been often told before. But we are by no means certain that it has ever been told more clearly, or more usefully ; never, perhaps, within so reasonable a compass. *Longa est injuria, longæ Ambages* : and it will be found a great convenience, by all who have no opportunity or inclination to buffet colossal folios, and to dig through *strata* of documentary evidence, to have the substantial merits of the case before them, within the covers of one very moderate volume.

The principal object of the writer has been to give the history of the Episcopacy of England, during that long interval of disastrous eclipse, which passed from the assembling of the Long Parliament, to the Restoration in 1660. More than one-third of the volume, however, is devoted to the requisite preliminary task of tracing the rise, and progress, and full development, of those principles, by which the Church of England was eventually overthrown. With a view to the faithful execution of his whole design, the author professes to have examined, not only the usual established authorities, but also the sermons, pamphlets, and other fugitive pieces of the time ; a class of writings, the knowledge of which is absolutely needful to the vivacity, and the distinctness, of the historical picture. It is, moreover, proper to state, that the impression, with which he addressed himself to his purpose,—(and, doubtless, the impression with which he rose from his researches,)—was, that there had, hitherto, been much iniquitous perversion of the motives and principles by which the policy of the church has been directed,—much exaggeration of the errors of individual churchmen,—much extenuation of the demerits of their adversaries,—and much extravagant demand of sympathy, on behalf of those, exclusively, who have been enrolled, as martyrs and confessors, in the calendar of Non-

conformity: in short, that the church, if not altogether blameless, has been, all along, beyond measure, "more sinned against than sinning."

For ourselves, we hardly know how to expect credit for perfect and serene impartiality, in reviewing these, the most momentous periods of our national history! Our convictions on the subject, it may be said, have long been formed; they have grown into that sort of moral and intellectual petrification, usually known by the name of *prejudice*. And, thus much we must confess,—that, in the exposition of our notions, such as they are, we have, of late years more especially, made such frequent demands upon the long-suffering of our readers, that it is not without reluctance and misgiving that we venture, once more, to lay our hand upon the ark. It is our persuasion, that few things, in the history of man, bear so indelible a mark of iniquity upon them, as the perseverance with which many writers have laboured to represent the spirit of persecution as a congenital disease, peculiar to the Episcopal Church: and this, with a grim array of facts incessantly before their eyes, which show, beyond all possibility of reasonable contradiction, that the same malady was, in former times, general, or rather universal; and that it raged, with most intense malignity, in the veins of those very men, by whom the church was worried and done to death. In this belief, we are mightily established by the details presented to us in the volume of Mr. Lathbury. And, if it should be asked, what can it profit to summon up the recollections of those "heavy times," and to stir, once more, the controversies which maddened and tormented our forefathers? we might confidently reply—*much every way*. In the first place, the world at large has a never-dying interest in the due apportionment of praise, or blame, between those contending parties, who have left a deep impression of themselves on succeeding generations. In the next place, like any other society or institution, the Church is sure to suffer, in her influence, and her honour, and her usefulness, from an inheritance of unrefuted obloquy and slander. If it be surmised that her present habit of tolerance is a virtue which necessity alone has compelled her to wear,—that it is a symptom of her weakness, rather than her wisdom and benignity,—she will, naturally enough, be regarded, not as a mild and tutelary power, but rather as a shackled tyrant, watching for the resumption of his lost ability to do mischief. Lastly, the Church, at present, is assailed with secret craft, and with open aggression, by parties calling themselves the spiritual descendants of those brave men, who unfurled, against her, the standard of our religious liberties: and those same parties are, now, in

high exultation at the thought, that the day of retribution is close at hand. For this last reason alone, it would be manifestly needful, that the voice of hatred and defiance should be met with the voice of a temperate, but continual and unwearied, protest, against the distortion and perversion of her former history. And, for all these reasons together, we fervently implore the sons and defenders of the Church to spare no pains for the attainment of correct and righteous views, relative to the truth of those *railing accusations*, which are hurled, to this day, with unabated vehemence, against the memory of her former champions. And,—whatever may be the value of our own judgment as to these matters,—we may, at least, be allowed to solicit their closest attention to the *facts*, which the present work will, most conveniently and compendiously, lay before them.

The mere outline of the history of Nonconformity and Schism, is simple enough. First, came the *moderate* Puritans, as they were called; the men whose consciences, as Bullinger fairly admonished them, were nursed in contention; who thought it consistent with their views of *moderation*, to vex and rend the church for matters which they themselves confessed to be unessential; and who, in the plenitude of their *moderation*, expected that the Hierarchy and the State should consign the public order and outward decency of Christian worship to the fastidious scruples and caprices of every individual minister. These men, on the whole, were treated with most considerate lenity: and, but for the sleepless and arrogant spirit of Geneva, the Church might, possibly, have had rest, when this 'fretful generation was gone by. Unhappily, however, within some ten or a dozen years after the accession of Elizabeth, the working of a much more powerful leaven began to manifest itself: and the result was, the *violent*, or *Presbyterian*, type of Puritanism. And, when it had assumed this form, the spirit of revolution began to *speak great things*,—things which, often, sounded like treason to the state; which openly threatened war, even “to the utterance,” against the Episcopal Church; and which proclaimed the Holy Discipline of Geneva to be neither more nor less than the very sceptre of Christ's kingdom. Now, be it always remembered, that the *children of disobedience*, who, under this inspiration, stood foremost in the ranks of Reform, were, in their way, the highest of all high Churchmen. They contended, stoutly and inflexibly, for the Divine right of the Presbytery; they abjured all toleration as nothing better than a legalized system of treachery to the Gospel of Christ; and they maintained that sovereigns should be, not so much the nursing *fathers*, as the faithful and obedient *sons* and servants, of the Church. It is

true, that they could, occasionally, complain of persecution, as all men are apt to complain of it, whenever the hand of the law lies heavy upon themselves. But these complaints were uttered by them, nearly, in the same breath, in which they denounced the adherents of Episcopacy as little better than Papists, idolaters, and apostates. The sequel is well known. Elizabeth of the Lion Heart, (and, we must add, of the lion maw, too, as the ravin of her royal den, from the spoils of the Church, can amply testify,) was gathered to her fathers. She was succeeded by a kindly-natured man, but, unfortunately for himself, a man of words and books—a talker of royalty—a professor of king-craft—one who was infinitely better qualified to occupy a *chair* than a *throne*. And he, again, was followed by a prince of accomplished intellect, and of noble and generous thoughts, but of unsteady judgment, and desultory energies. All this while, the genius of Nonconformity was gathering strength. It still vented itself in a perpetual and tragic outcry against pomps and ceremonies; it allied itself, by a sort of elective affinity, with all the elements of religious and political discontent which might be afloat in every region of society; and, at the same time, it was gradually collecting and concentrating the resources of a most atrocious despotism. In the fulness of time, the Church, and the monarchy, fell beneath its assault. And then did it put forth such prodigies of intolerance, as seemed to threaten the whole realm with irretrievable degradation. Fortunately, however, as it would appear, for the *eventual* preservation of our liberties, there arose out of the abyss another formidable Power, which wore upon its thigh the name of Independency: and this Power seized upon the sword, and proclaimed itself the *protector* of all diversities of religious faith; and before it, the genius of the Presbytery stood rebuked. But nevertheless, between these two antagonists, the heart of England, for a time, was well nigh torn to pieces. The people *looked for justice, but, behold, oppression; and for righteousness, but, behold, a cry!* And the result was, that the tyranny, at length, became intolerable, and the throne and the altar rose again from the dust.

Such, it has always appeared to us, is the brief, but faithful, version of this eventful history; always to be understood, however, with most abundant and generous allowance, for many an illustrious individual exception. And, the truth of this version is most potently confirmed by the author's review of that portion of the history, which relates more especially to the fortunes of the Anglican Church. While, however, we most readily acknowledge the value of his performance, there are one or two matters, respecting which, in our poor judgment, his trumpet

renders forth a sound, by no means in strict unison with the truth. He seems to imagine, for instance, that the uncompromising assertion of Episcopacy was, as it were, an *after-thought* of the Reformation. We hear nothing, he tells us, of the Divine institution of the Episcopal order, for many years after the accession of Elizabeth. On this point, the rulers and the advocates of the Church were silent, until they were driven, by sheer stress of controversy, to the necessity of speaking out. They were content to say, merely, that Episcopal government was "agreeable to the word of God," until they heard the men of Geneva proclaim, that *no* form of government, but their own, was "agreeable to the word of God;" that their discipline resembled the tabernacle, whose pattern was revealed in the Mount; and that, as for the Church of England, she "had" "neither the word rightly preached, nor the sacraments sincerely" "ministered; and that she mixed together Christ and Antichrist, "God and the Devil." Even Hooker himself, we are told, and all the writers of that day, affirmed that forms of Church government were to be numbered among things mutable and unessential. They held, indeed, that the Anglican Church adhered more closely, than any other, to the Apostolic *practice*. But the thought of asserting the necessity of the Episcopal model never once entered their heads, till long after the establishment of the principles of the Reformation; and probably never *would* have entered their heads, if it had not been put into them by the desperate arrogance, with which the violent Puritans began to assert, in England, the discipline of Calvin. So that, if this representation be correct, the secret language of the later champions of the Church must have been something to this effect:—
 "It is exceedingly perplexing and troublesome to deal with
 "these hot-brained fanatics. If they succeed in persuading the
 "people that *their* ordinances are the only ones stamped with
 "the Divine approbation, we shall never be able to make head
 "against them. So, the best thing that we can do, is to start an
 "opposition scheme, and to set up a Divine Right of our own!"
 And that such *were* actually their motives and their reasonings, is very plainly intimated by the constitutional historian, who says,
 "It was not till afterwards, that the defenders of the established
 "order found out, that one claim of Divine right was best met
 "by another."

And yet, one would imagine, that none but an inveterate scorner could affect to believe that baseness like this could have ever found its way into the heart of those prelates and divines who formed the school which is now usually known by the designation of *High Church*. And, lest any one should rise from the perusal of

the volume before us, with impressions so unworthy of those venerated names, we would earnestly implore the attention of every student of our Church history to certain corrective and cautionary considerations.

It is scarcely credible then, that the notion of Church authority, derived from our Lord himself, and continued by succession from his Apostles, should have been altogether new and strange to the compilers of the Liturgy, and to the men who upheld the Liturgy through good report and evil report, and suffered persecution for it. They who framed the ordination services, and they to whom the pastoral commission was given in the language of those services, must have been familiar with the doctrine, that Episcopacy was something more than one of many forms of Ecclesiastical polity, all equally legitimate, though not all equally expedient. But then, it may be asked, how came it to pass that mighty and accomplished Divines, such as Jewel and Archbishop Whitgift, should have failed to occupy that high ground, to which the offices of the Church so manifestly pointed; and should have satisfied themselves with barely contending that, since the Church had in fact been ruled by bishops from the earliest times, it could not be right to abandon that mode of government, whenever the same could be maintained? This question, most undoubtedly, demands an answer. But the answer involves a considerable variety of particulars. We solicit the attention of readers (or, at least, of the less instructed portion of them,) to the following statement of those particulars.

In the first place, then, let any Churchman imagine himself living in those days, when the nation was in the very agony of her deliverance from the cruelty and the superstition of Rome,—heart-stricken with the recent horrors of the Marian persecution, and shuddering at the thought of a repetition of those enormities. What, under circumstances so appalling, would be his emotions and his reflections? Would not his first wish be, that all the existing elements of strength should be gathered round the cause, which was as the very breath of life to his country? Would not his feelings, as a Catholic Christian, be probably merged, for the time, in his feelings as a Protestant Christian? Would he not shrink from every thing that could send disunion and weakness into the Protestant body, almost as he would shrink from perfidy and treason? Would he not, therefore, be apt to deprecate the needless agitation of any one question, which could by possibility terminate in the alienation of the continental brotherhood? Now, of all questions that can be imagined, none was more likely so to terminate than the question of Church authority, considered with reference to its derivation, and the hands to which it ought to be

consigned. Can it, then, be surprising that this question should be, not forgotten, but held in reserve, by the Fathers of the English Reformation, at a period when that Reformation was in a condition of unsettlement, and urgently required a long interval of harmony and peace for its consolidation.

But further, the natural reluctance against every thing which might have an ungracious aspect towards the foreign champions of the Reformation, was greatly strengthened by feelings of generous, and even of personal sympathy, for those noble spirits. Where was it but among the Helvetic fraternities, that our exiled confessors received shelter, and kindness, and hospitality, in the days of their adversity? And who were the men, who, at that very time, were labouring, as it were in the midst of the fire, to establish the Protestant cause immoveably in France and in the Netherlands? Were they not, all of them, disciples of the school of Calvin? And, so long as the Episcopal form of government remained, in this country, unquestioned and unassailed, would it not, naturally, appear almost like the wantonness of insult, to harass them with aggressive discussions on such debateable matters, while they were prodigally pouring out their life-blood in conflict with the common enemy.

So much for the earlier period of the English Reformation, subsequently to the inhuman reign of Mary. But at length a time of domestic trouble and confusion came on. The aversion for habits and ceremonies, and other external matters, grew into a fierce hatred and defiance of the hierarchy. The whole constitution of the Church was contemptuously assailed, and confronted with the Divine Supremacy of the Genevan Discipline. What then, under this change of circumstances, became the duty of our spiritual guides and rulers? Unquestionably, to put forth all the might which they felt to be inherent in their own cause. The time was now gone by, when it could be safe or honest, to be silent on the peculiar claims of the Anglican Church to the allegiance of her children. Those claims were scornfully rejected: and therefore it was needful to explore, and to lay open, the ground on which they rested. It behoved the well-instructed scribes to survey their resources, and to bring forth from their store *things old*, as well as *new*, in support of their authority. And, for this office, they were happily prepared by an interval of exemption from the pressure of the Romish controversy. Leisure was thus afforded for studious research into primitive antiquity. A new school of Ecclesiastical writers was gradually rising up, who began to cast away from them certain portions of the lore, which intercourse with the continental Protestants had rendered nearly as familiar as household words among many of the earlier

" Men may be, extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways ad-
 " mitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when
 " God himself doth, of himself, raise up any, whose labour he
 " useth, without requiring that men should authorize them ; but
 " then he doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens,
 " himself, from heaven. Another extraordinary kind of
 " vocation is, when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to
 " leave the usual ways of the Church, which, otherwise, we would
 " willingly keep : where the church must needs have some or-
 " dained, and neither hath, nor can have possibly, a bishop to
 " ordain. In case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of
 " God hath *oftentimes*, and may, give place. And, therefore, we
 " are not, simply and without exception, to urge a lineal descent
 " of power from the Apostles, by continual succession of bishops,
 " in every effectual ordination. These cases of inevitable neces-
 " sity excepted, none may ordain, but only bishops."* With
 respect to this latter passage, it has been very justly remarked by
 Mr. Keble,† " with what exact conditions, of *extreme* necessity,
 " *unwilling* deviation, *impossibility* of procuring a bishop to
 " ordain, Hooker has limited his concession." Still, it must be
 remembered, that, with all its limitations, the concession was too
 large for a later school of Churchmen. For, when Hall's Trea-
 tise on Episcopacy was in preparation, Laud objected most
 decidedly to *his* concession, that " the Presbyterian government
 might be of use, where Episcopacy could not be had." This
 proposition, the Archbishop observed, was, in the first place,
 nugatory ; since, as he conceived, there was no place where
 Episcopacy might not be had. Moreover, the concession was
 of dangerous consequence ; for " since they challenged their
 " Presbyterian fiction to be Christ's kingdom and ordinance, and
 " cast out Episcopacy as opposite to it, we ought not to use any
 " mincing terms, but unmask them plainly."

It scarcely can be doubted that, when this admission was
 made by Hooker, his thoughts were with the Protestant Churches
 of the continent, rather than with the Church of the primitive
 Fathers. And it will hardly be deemed surprising, that he
 should feel himself somewhat crippled, in argument, by the
 difficulties arising out of *their* un-episcopal condition. More-
 over, he was stared in the face by one extremely perplexing fact,
 that numbers had, at that period, been admitted into the ministry
 of the Church of England, who had no other than Presbyterian
 orders to produce. It would, nevertheless, be unpardonably

* Book vii. Sect. 14, Vol. iii. pp. 195, 196.

† Preface, &c. p. lxxvi.

rash and hasty, to conclude that Episcopal Government was reckoned by him in the number of those things which, like mere rites and ceremonies, are in their own nature indifferent and changeable; and which may, accordingly, be changed, purely by the authority of the Church. We have seen above, that, in his judgment, the change from Episcopal Government to some other form, if warrantable at all, could be actually warranted by nothing short of manifest and irresistible necessity: a necessity such as should amount to a virtual dispensation, proceeding from Him whom, elsewhere, he acknowledges to be the Author and the Founder of the institution. But, further, it should carefully be recollected with what manner of adversaries he was, throughout, contending. It was one main principle of the Genevan school, that "only one law, the Scripture, *must* be the "rule to direct us in all things, even so far as to the taking up of "a rush or straw;" and that "the Scripture of God is, in such "sort, the rule of human actions; that, *simply*, whatsoever we do, "and are not by it directed thereunto, the same is sin."* And, by virtue of this principle, they laboured to establish the supreme authority of the Presbyterian discipline. For, "Scripture being the *only* rule of all things which, in this life, may be done by men," it needs must follow that the whole system of Ecclesiastical Government,—plan, elevation, and accompaniments,—*must* be distinctly and imperatively laid down in Scripture. Their argument, in short, was this;—before opening the Bible, we might be quite certain that it would contain, *first*, all necessary doctrine, relative to the dealings of God with the souls of men; *secondly*, that it would furnish express directions for the construction and administration of Christian societies; and, consequently, that, on pain of God's displeasure, nothing must be added to the words written in that book, touching either discipline or doctrine; neither must any thing be taken away from the same, for ever. Now, in reply to all this, the Churchman would, at once, allow the *former* proposition,—namely, that in a revelation from God, all doctrines relative to man's acceptance with God, would, of course, be amply and explicitly set forth; and that no jot or tittle of those doctrines shall ever pass away. But he would *not* be prepared to concede the latter proposition,—namely, that we might be quite sure, beforehand, of finding, in the Scriptures, certain definite and unchangeable directions for the government and constitution of the Church. These are matters which, for any thing that we can know, *à priori*, might, either be left at large, or else inflexibly prescribed. And,

* Book ii. Vol. i. pp. 295, 297.

whether such things are mutable or not, is to be determined, not by our *previous* conceptions of their fitness or necessity, but by the manner and form in which they have been actually delivered to us. In order, therefore, to ascertain the extent of our obligations, respecting all such matters, we must consult the record itself; and, in our interpretation of the record, we, doubtless, are at liberty to use the light, both of natural reason, and of ecclesiastical history. And, precisely conformable to this view, is the following language of Hooker himself:—"In matters
 " which concern the actions of God, the most dutiful way, on our
 " part, is to search what God *hath done*; and, with meekness, to
 " admire that, rather than to dispute what He, in congruity of
 " reason, *ought to do*. The ways which He hath, whereby to do
 " all things for the greatest good of his Church, are more in
 " number than we can search; other, in nature, than that we
 " should presume to determine which, of the many, should be the
 " fittest for Him to choose, till such time as we see he *hath* chosen,
 " of many, some one; which one, we may, then, boldly conclude
 " to be the fittest, because He hath taken it before the rest."*
 From all which it may safely be inferred,—*not* that, in Hooker's judgment, men were at liberty to tamper with such appointments and ordinances of God, as he had, himself, manifestly declared to be unchangeable,—but, simply, that men could never be in a condition to presume, *à priori*, that God *must needs* guard the polity of his Church with a system of inflexible and irrevocable law.

The dispute may, perhaps, be capable of some illustration, by reference to the question of the Church's infallibility. The main argument of the Romanist is this—"It is utterly incredible that
 " God should have left his Church to be torn to pieces by inter-
 " minable controversies. Without looking into the Bible, we
 " might be absolutely certain, beforehand, that he *would* provide
 " the Christian world with a tribunal for the final settlement of
 " all debateable points of faith." The answer of the *Reformed* Catholic to the *Roman* Catholic is precisely similar to that of Hooker to the Puritan—"It is our part to search what God *hath done*; not to
 " dispute what He, in congruity of reason, ought to do."

It is not true, then, that this illustrious Divine, with the Bible, and the history of the Church, both open before him, was content to place the polity of the Church among the number of indifferent and unessential matters. All that he contended for, was this—that, until the *will* of God, respecting the polity of the Church should be clearly ascertained, it would be insufferably presump-

* Book iii. ad fin.

tuous in man to declare that the *Word* of God must, of necessity, contain within itself a body of complete and unalterable canons. And how was the will of God, touching this matter, to be found out, but by a course of reverential inquiry into the sense of the New Testament, as interpreted by natural reason, and the uniform practice of the ancient Church?

And here, it must always be remembered, that Hooker was by no means driven into this course of argument by apprehensions, lest defeat should await him, if he should meet his adversaries upon their own ground. He himself has expressly provided against any such unworthy misconception. "They may perhaps imagine," he says, "that we are fain to argue for the changeableness of laws ordained even by God himself, as if, otherwise, their discipline, of necessity, should take place, and that, under which we live, be abandoned. There is no remedy, therefore, but to abate this error in them; and directly to let them know, that if they fall into this conceit, they do but a little flatter their own cause. As for us, we think in no respect so highly of it. Our persuasion is, that no age ever had knowledge of it, but ours; that they which defend it, devised it; that neither Christ nor his apostles at any time taught it, but the contrary. If, therefore, we did seek to maintain that, which most advantageth our cause, *the very best way for us, and the strongest against them, were to hold, even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of Church polity, which God hath instituted, and which, for that very cause, belongeth to all Churches, and to all times.* But with any such partial eye, to respect ourselves, and, by cunning, to make those things seem the truest which are fittest to serve our purpose, is a thing which we neither like nor mean to follow."* It is evident from this, that Hooker declines, "in behalf of the episcopal succession, the mode of reasoning *from antecedent necessity*, on which the Puritans relied so confidently, in behalf of their pastors, elders, and deacons:"† and this, not because he feared it, but purely because he questioned its legitimacy. And if, after all, it should be urged that the current of his practical conclusions flows through lower ground than that, on which the fountain-head of his own principles is seated, we have only to recollect the multitude of peculiar circumstances which may have influenced their course. And yet, in truth, the depression is not much! The amount of it, we think, may be fairly estimated from the following passage. "For my own part, although I see that certain Reformed Churches, (the Scottish especially, and

* Book iii. s. 12, vol. i. p. 403.

† Keble's Preface, &c. p. 73.

“ French), have not that which best agreeth with sacred Scripture,—I mean the government that is by bishops,—inasmuch as both Churches are fallen under a different regimen, (which to remedy is, for the one, altogether too late, and too soon for the other, during their present affliction and trouble) ; this, their *defect and imperfection*, I would rather lament, *in such a case*, than exagitate : considering that men, oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regimen which is best, and to content themselves with that, which, either the irremediable error of former times, or the necessity of the present, hath cast upon them.” *

So much for the earlier school of Anglican High Churchmen. And now, we would ask, whether even this brief and cursory review of that school is not abundantly sufficient to enable us to fix a due and fit estimate upon the assertion of Mr. Lathbury, that “ Laud’s *new* opinions, on the question of the divine right, *originated* in the lofty and absurd pretensions of the advocates for the presbyterian polity ?” The opinions of Laud were *not* new. To say nothing of their identity with the opinions of the primitive Divines, they were, at least with one exception, the same as the opinions of Hooker. Hooker allowed that there might be emergencies in which Episcopacy could not be had. Laud, on the other hand, professed himself unable to imagine any such emergency. And if this—which is a question of facts and circumstances, rather than a question of doctrine—could once have been settled between them, or their followers, their opinions would almost, if not altogether, have come to a perfect coincidence with each other. Again, it may be true, that “ the lofty and absurd pretensions of the advocates for the Presbyterian polity” furnished the occasion which *first* called forth the Divines of the Reformation to a vigorous defence of Episcopacy. But that, in any other sense than this, the opinions of the *divine right* had their *origin* in the notions and principles of Geneva, is an assertion which we are no more prepared to endure, than we are prepared to believe that the Athanasian symbol had its origin in the same school. In saying this, however, we earnestly desire not to be misunderstood. We have no suspicion whatever that this affirmation is to be ascribed, on the part of Mr. Lathbury, to a feeling of defective allegiance towards the church of his fathers. We rather attribute it to an accidental forgetfulness of historical and controversial details. And, accordingly, we respectfully suggest, that in case his work should reach a second edition, (which

* Book iii. sect. 11, vol. i. p. 422, 423.

we cordially hope that it will), he would take the trouble of renewing his recollections.

We do indeed imagine, that his recollections, on this subject, may have been somewhat enfeebled and disturbed by certain "saucy doubts and fears," of which, if Charity be the mother, the Genius of *Rationalism* may not unjustly be suspected as the father. Like many other pious and benevolent men, Mr. Lathbury appears to be in sore amazement at the sweeping excommunication which the High-church principles are supposed to be dealing out over a vast portion of Protestant Christendom. If episcopal government be *necessary*, then there can be no true Church where Episcopacy is not. And the consequences of this position are too fearful to be endured!!

Now, in the first place, we cannot but wonder that the persons who feel themselves so much overpowered by this consideration, are able to open their Bible without still deeper commotion of spirit. For it is written in the Bible, that *there is no other name, under heaven, given among men, whereby we may be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ*: And again, that *he who hath not the Son hath not the Father*. And, upon these declarations, a man might meditate, almost to despair and madness, if he brought with him, to the inquiry, an unchastised and inquisitive temper. For, seeing that the name of Jesus Christ is known throughout only a small portion of the earth, it would seem as if a sentence of the direst excommunication was here pronounced against a vast majority of the human race.

In the next place, we have always understood that it is no legitimate proceeding, in theological discussion, to load every proposition of the adversary with the weight of all the extreme consequences which, by rigorous inference, may be connected with it. There are many truths in divinity which it may be our sacred duty to contend for; but which, nevertheless, it may be no part of our duty to reconcile, by logical process, with the attributes of God, or to bring into agreement with the suggestions of our own reason. Thus, for instance, the alleged *necessity* of revelation may seem to imply the eternal perdition of all who have it not. And yet, it will scarcely be expected of those who, in obedience to the divine commandments, declare the *necessity* of revelation, likewise to explain and vindicate the appalling consequences which apparently it involves. In the same manner, they who conscientiously believe that episcopal government is founded on divine right, must not be deterred from insisting on that right by the objection that, thereby, we confine the grace and blessings of the Church to a limited section of the Christian world. And, if so, neither can the gainsayer nullify the claim, by an outcry against

the fearful results involved in the successful assertion of that claim.

But thirdly—if the gainsayer should still cry out, with tragical reiteration, “only think upon the consequences,”—we would suggest that, after all, the consequences, whatever they may be, are in the hand of God, and not in the hand of man. With the consequences, therefore, we can have nothing to do, save reverently and charitably to hope and trust, that what, in peremptory form, is laid down to us as law, may, in the divine administration of it, be graciously qualified and mitigated. But, against all these restless and *rationalizing* appeals, the Scriptures of God have provided one simple *piaculum*; namely, that things revealed belong to *us*; and that secret things belong to; *Him*. The only question therefore is, what things *are* revealed, and what things *are* left in darkness and concealment. And, if it should appear, by sufficient evidence, that certain promises have been delivered to us under certain limitations, our part is, manifestly, to proclaim the promises even as they are set forth to us, and to leave to Him the discretion according to which the limitations shall be finally enforced. It is a general truth that the Gospel is necessary to the salvation of men. But still, there may be secret ways, in which the blessings of the Gospel shall, in certain measure, be extended to the souls of them who never heard the sound of it. In like manner, it may be a general truth, that Episcopacy is needful for the due formation of a Church. And yet, there may be secret ways, in which the privileges and blessings of a Church may be imparted to societies which, from various causes, are destitute of that peculiar polity. But then, the distinction, in either case, is this—that men are entrusted with the declaration of the *general truth*; but that they are not entrusted with the power of proclaiming what shall be the rigour, or what the indulgence, with which the general truth shall finally be carried out into operation. The sum of the matter, therefore is this—that, although God is not tied down, even to his own ordinances, man *is* tied down to the faithful proclamation of those ordinances. And, therefore, to exact of his ministers that they should *liberally*, (for that is the current phrase,) dilute and lower what they believe to be his injunctions, is neither more nor less than to exact that they should obey man rather than God.

But, lastly—we may possibly be called upon to reflect on the narrow and inhuman bigotry with which these *exclusive* principles have a tendency to freeze and to petrify the human breast! Here, however, we are transported at once beyond the boundaries of sober argument. And, accordingly, we know not well how to dispose of any such passionate appeal, otherwise than by exclaim-

ing,—the Lord in his mercy regard and amend that miserable man (if any such there be) who is unable to maintain his fidelity to God, without an immolation of all kind and charitable emotion towards his brethren! For our part, we do verily and solemnly believe, that what are called High Church principles have, *in themselves*, no tendency whatever to convert the milk of human kindness into gall. On the contrary, it is our firm and honest persuasion, (and we speak it with a multitude of living examples in our view,) that in no class or section of Christian society, are generous and kindly, aye, and truly Catholic feelings, to be found in brighter perfection, than among the advocates of those reviled and calumniated principles. And this phenomenon, strange and paradoxical as it may appear to some, is easily enough accounted for, without ascending up into heaven, or going down into the deep, for the solution of it. The explanation is nigh unto us, and of great simplicity. For the speech of the *High Churchman* is on this wise, to those who are separate from the communion of the Church, ‘*Here is my position, and there is yours. With respect to certain matters, approximation is impossible. With respect to all other matters, let courtesy, and good-will, and brotherly love, abound. And if we must provoke one another to jealousy, let it only be, by an emulous prosecution of all good, and holy, and charitable works, to be carried on by us, each in our own sphere. If we will be contending, let us contend like the olive and the vine, who shall produce the best and most fruit; not like the aspin and the elm, which shall make most noise in a wind.*’* Such, we doubt not, is the language, and such the feeling, which prevails among the most faithful and inflexible champions of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church. And surely their words are words of charity, and peace, and wisdom, and integrity. But, what if the passion for approximation should predominate? Will not the probable result be, a compromise of principle, which will have any effect rather than that of augmenting mutual respect; and perhaps a fretful conflict, upon matters of doubtful disputation, which may end in secret and bitter alienation of heart? Do we not know that the smallest beginnings of strife are as when one letteth out water? And do we not likewise know that strife is best avoided by a cautious and respectful distance between opposite parties, who have been committed, by circumstance or education, each to the support of a momentous and spirit-stirring cause?

Unmoved, therefore, by the formidable array of *consequences*, or by monstrous pictures of the ugliness of bigotry, we shall con-

* Jer. Taylor, vol. vi. p. 315, Ed. Heb.

clude this subject with the words of a *bishop*, who never yet was accused of an intolerant temper : “ That must needs be a supreme
 “ order from whence ordination itself proceeds. For it is evident
 “ and notorious, that in Scripture there is no record of ordina-
 “ tion, but an apostolical hand was in it ; one of the *ἀνδρες*
 “ *ἡγούμενοι* ; one of the chief, one of the superior and ruling clergy.
 “ And it is as certain that, in the descending ages of the Church,
 “ the Bishop always had that power. It was never denied to *him* ;
 “ and it was never imputed to *Presbyters*. And St. Jerome himself,
 “ when pouring out his anger against John, bishop of Jerusalem,
 “ he endeavoured to equal the presbyter with the bishop, (though
 “ in many places he spake otherwise,) yet, even then also, and in
 “ that heat, he excepted ordination, acknowledging that to be the
 “ Bishop’s peculiar. And, therefore they who go about to extin-
 “ guish Episcopacy, do as Julian did. Although they mean not
 “ so, yet they destroy the Presbytery, and starve the flock, and
 “ take away their shepherds, and dispark their pastures, *and tempt*
 “ *God’s providence to extraordinaries, and put the people to hard*
 “ *shifts*, and turn the channels of salvation quite another way, and
 “ leave the Church to a perpetual uncertainty, whether she be
 “ alive or dead, and the people destitute of the life of their souls,
 “ and their daily bread, and their spiritual comforts, and holy
 “ blessings.”*

Having thus delivered ourselves respecting the only point of any essential moment on which we have any difference with Mr. Lathbury, we must dismiss the rest of his work with a briefness very much disproportionate to its interest and importance. We cannot, however, forbear to express, before we part with him, some strong tendencies to dissent from the estimate he has formed of the conduct of the Usurper ; of him, whom some have called a *great* man ; others, only an *extraordinary* man ; and of whom Clarendon has said, that it is impossible to pronounce his condemnation, without, at the same time, pronouncing his encomium. That he had many of the elements of greatness in his nature, it would be the merest stolidity to doubt. But, among those elements, we know not how to reckon the enlightened views of toleration which have been ascribed to him by some, and which Mr. Lathbury seems half disposed to concede to him. It may be true, that the proscription of the Episcopalians was, on the whole, somewhat less brutal, under his rule, than it was under the ferocious tyranny of the Presbyterians. But it is likewise undeniable that the penurious measure of indulgence dealt out by him, was regulated solely by a regard to the peculiar exigencies of his own

* Jer. Taylor, vol. vi. p. 315, 316.

position. It must be remembered that, during the Protectorate, a *scandalous* minister was one who was guilty of profaneness, of adultery, of drunkenness, of gambling, or—of *publicly and frequently reading the Book of Common Prayer*; that the intercession of Owen was required to rescue Pococke from the fangs of Cromwell's commissioners; and that the Liturgy was, for the most part, used with almost as much secrecy, as if it had been an institute of sorcery. That the vigorous good sense of the Usurper may have been partially overruled by his Council of military fanatics, is altogether likely enough. It is also probable that, in his secret heart, he hated the Presbyterians as cordially as he hated the Episcopalians—perhaps *more* cordially. But all this, if admitted, only proves that his toleration, and his intolerance, were alike the dictates, not of lofty and generous wisdom, but of mere political expedience or necessity. Besides, it must be kept in mind, that Cromwell, so far as he was a religious character at all, was the “child and champion” of Independency. And every one knows that, when Independency migrated to New England, it put forth such capacities of tyranny and persecution, as St. Dominic himself might almost have envied.

The only remaining topic which we have room to notice, is the Act of Uniformity. We have recently declared, that this is a passage in the history of our Church, to which we look back with no great complacency. We could wish that, in the concoction and the execution of this measure, there had been less appearance of vindictive precipitation. Nevertheless, we scruple not to declare our concurrence in the opinion expressed by Mr. Lathbury, that the outcry which followed it, and which has never ceased to echo from that time to this, was vastly more loud and bitter than the occasion warranted. The parliament, as Bishop Heber has observed, was compelled to decide upon one of three courses: *first*, a Liturgy which all could approve; *secondly*, not to insist upon uniformity; *thirdly*, to impose one uniform system upon all.* The first of these expedients was a manifest impossibility. The second was beset with difficulty and danger. The third was in harmony with the principles of the age, and was recommended by the notorious and general attachment of the nation to their Liturgy. And it is difficult to imagine with what face its severity could be complained of by those very men, who had crammed the Covenant and the Directory down the throats of the people, almost at the sword's point; or by those, who had handled the lovers and admirers of the Liturgy as savagely, as if they had been guilty of the sin of idolatry or witchcraft. Besides, it should never be for-

* Life of Taylor, p. 90.

gotten that, among the sufferers of Bartholomew's Day, there were many who would, most certainly, have been ejected by the Presbyterians themselves, if the dominion of the Presbytery had been restored: soldiers and mechanics, for instance, who were destitute of ordination, either Presbyterian or Episcopal; and who yet had been thrust into the occupation of incumbencies. It should also be considered, that the ejection of 1662 was a single act, and not a lingering process; whereas, the sequestration of the Episcopal ministers was a process carried on, almost incessantly, for twenty years. An inquisition was instituted, which, throughout that period, pervaded the whole land, in the length and breadth of it; and, while it lasted, the Clergy may, without much exaggeration, be said to have lived the life of hunted animals. No labour or artifice was spared to degrade them in the estimation of their flocks. The accuser was about their path, and about their bed. The most *ignorant* and brutish among their people were encouraged to stand forth against them, with charges of *ignorance* and insufficiency; and the most worthless, to brand them with the stamp of moral infamy. The shafts flew so thick, and were so constantly abroad, that no one knew who might be stricken next. Even Clement Walker, the *Presbyterian*, who wrote the History of Independency, in speaking of the commissioners for the removal of scandalous ministers, under the Protectorate, declares, that to *historize* their oppressions at large, would require a volume as big as the Book of Martyrs; that the people were then persuaded that they might as easily find charity in hell, as justice in any committee; and that the King had taken down one star-chamber, and the Parliament had set up a hundred. And it is well known, that between 1640 and the dissolution of the Long Parliament, the Clergy had been as mercilessly harassed by committees of sequestration. With all cautious allowance, therefore, for the supposed exaggerations of martyrology, (of which Mr. Hallam has taken good care to remind us,) it may reasonably be concluded that the "sufferings of the Clergy" were, beyond all comparison, more severe than those inflicted upon the Bartholomew men by the act of 1662.

Of the numbers who suffered, under either infliction, it is extremely difficult to procure any satisfactory estimate. The papers of many of the committees of sequestration were destroyed, previously to the Restoration; a circumstance almost fatal to the hope of an exact result. Nothing, however, can well be more monstrously extravagant than the statement of Calamy; who asserts, that the Bartholomew sufferers were more numerous than the Episcopal. It is observed by Mr. Lathbury, that in the manuscript of Mr. Jeremy Stephens, who collected a

large mass of materials on the subject, the number of sequestrations is reckoned at eight thousand. That eight thousand *deserved* sequestration, was affirmed, in Parliament, by the notorious *Century White*. And, soon after this, in his "First Century of Scandalous Ministers," the same worthy declared that he had, himself, actually turned out that number in the space of four or five years. Whether this mighty cleanser boasted of *Augean* toils greater than he had actually undergone, it would be needless to inquire. At all events, the best authorities concur in stating that more than one half of the clergy were driven out to beggary. If, then, we fix the number of sequestrations at five thousand, and the number of ejections on Bartholomew's Day, at the usual estimate of two thousand, we shall be tolerably secure from exaggeration, on the one side, or extenuation, on the other.

We are, sometimes, reminded of the merciful and generous assignment of one-fifth part of the income of sequestrated livings, to the men who were iniquitously driven from them! But, alas! ἐχθρῶν ἄδωρα δῶρα. The bounty was, for the most part, no bounty to the sufferers. The payment of the fifths was, very frequently, evaded, and could scarcely ever be enforced. And all this did the sufferers endure with a meekness and a patience, which might be a spectacle to men and angels. But were not, then, the ejected men, "*peaceable* sufferers" too? Let the historian of the Constitution pronounce the encomium of their submissive gentleness: "To suffer in silence has, *at no time*, been "a virtue with our Protestant Dissenters."* At *that* time, assuredly, heaven and earth rung with their complaints. And, to this hour, few subjects are more familiar with their descendants, than the barbarities of the *second* Bartholomew's Day.

We have no delight in these topics of *recrimination*, as they may possibly be called. They are, beyond measure, wearisome and distressing to all pacific and charitable minds. But the Church has been, and is, daily reviled; reviled, not only by the voice of living calumny, but by the tongue which is put into the mouth of her past history. And though it becomes not her, or her defenders, to revile again, it *does* become them to appeal to the testimony of facts; and to do this, with all freedom of speech, and confidence of heart. For such testimony speaks plainly, to this effect,—that if, in less happy times, the freedom of conscience was galled by the fetters of Protestant Episcopacy, the iron rule of Sectarianism was such as enters into the very soul.

* Hallam, vol i. p. 270.

ART. IV.—*The Divine Glory Manifested in the Conduct and Discourses of our Lord. Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1836, at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury.*
By Charles A. Ogilvie, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and late Fellow of Balliol College. Oxford, Parker; and London, Rivingtons.

WE hail the appearance of this volume with feelings of unfeigned satisfaction. The subject of the Lectures which it contains is indeed inexhaustible; and hence, the discussion of it, in so limited a space as that of the “Eight Divinity Lecture Sermons,” prescribed by the will of the Founder, must necessarily involve a very brief and summary notice of many most important points, and leave many more altogether unregarded and untold. “The Divine Glory Manifested in the Conduct and Discourses of our Lord,” is the avowed object of Mr. Ogilvie’s inquiry; and in the pursuit of this, he has selected such passages from the Four Gospels, as appeared to him best adapted to confirm and illustrate the end he had in view. But still, after all the pains he has bestowed upon this inquiry—however judicious the arrangement under which he has classified his materials, however apposite the examples which he has chosen, or however cogent and appropriate the inferences which he has drawn—he is constrained to confess that the copious theme remains unexhausted. “The Divine Economy—that dispensation of God’s mercy, for the salvation of which the Prophets of former times inquired and searched diligently, and in which the angels desire to look, may for ever yield employment for the understanding, and engagement for the heart and affections of the faithful Christian.”—p. 226.

A more limited field of investigation, therefore, might have seemed, in some respects, to be preferred to that which he has here chosen to traverse; since a greater degree of compactness and of finish would thereby have been given to the work. And had Mr. Ogilvie been a man who looked only to the nice adjustment of his own theories, or sought to square the authority of Scripture and of the early Christian writers by them; no doubt he could easily have selected some single and minute subject out of the large range allowed to him, and successfully lavished upon it the stores of a learned and the refinements of an ingenious mind. But his aim has been rather to lead others to the study of those sacred records which have proved a guide and solace to his own mind, than to dogmatize respecting the conclusion which he himself has drawn. His train of thought is more suggestive than di-

dactic, more practical than speculative. In the beautiful language of Robert Boyle, (which he has quoted among the many valuable notes and illustrations of his volume), he uses "the Scripture not as an arsenal, to be resorted to only for arms and weapons to defend party or defeat its enemies; but as a matchless temple, where he delights to be, to contemplate the beauty, the symmetry and the magnificence of the structure; and to increase his awe and excite his devotion to the Deity there preached and adored."

In truth, we think it to be pre-eminently the merit of these Lectures, that they lead us to "*an uncontroversial study of the Gospels*." Whilst they are far removed from that superficial style of handling the sacred narrative, which forms so general a characteristic in the fashionable theology of the day; whilst they furnish evidences, at every step, of the careful comparison which the author has made of things spiritual with spiritual, and of the successful labour with which he has explored the remains of Christian antiquity, their avowed design and tendency is to fix the attention of the student upon the writings of the Four Evangelists. Not so indeed, as to forget or undervalue any other portion of the whole counsel of God, but still they would lead him to recognize in those writings the beginning and the end of all Scriptural inquiry; and however varied and extensive that inquiry may be,—whether directed to the sanctions of the Law, the roll of Prophecy, the songs of the inspired Psalmist, or the teaching of St. Paul and his fellow-labourers in Christ throughout their Epistles, they would teach him to confess that, after all,—the wisdom of the wise, and the erudition of the learned, and the piety of the devout, will be best cherished and preserved by returning, in a guileless humble spirit, to the perusal of these pure and simple narratives. From them, may the clearest illustrations of the "great mystery of Godliness,—God manifest in the flesh," be derived; and the practical application of that blessed doctrine be most effectually brought home to the heart, by seeing the living reality of it, which they exhibit in the Person and Ministry of the Incarnate Word.

The peculiar advantages attendant upon the study of this portion of the Sacred Volume, are thus stated by Mr. Ogilvie, in his first Lecture.

"If we rightly understand and duly use our Christian privilege, we are allowed to see God, no longer by dim analogy; nor darkly through the ill-reflecting mirror of human reasoning and deduction, but *substantially* revealed, in the Person of His well-beloved Son, in whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' The Divine Majesty is thus veiled, without being in any degree sullied. The awe and reverence, which the presence of God is fitted to inspire, are tempered and mode-

rated by a sense of His condescension to our low estate. His attributes of justice and of benevolence, which most nearly concern us, as subjects of His moral government, are rendered distinctly intelligible ; and are shown to be exercised towards us on principles, that are in strict accordance with the apprehensions of our minds and the sentiments of our hearts ; whilst His attributes of power, of knowledge, and of purity, (attributes, on the first discovery of which, weak, sinful, and dependant beings may well shudder,) are so brought near and so benignantly accommodated to our thoughts and feelings, as to encourage our reliance on them, and our hope of being benefited by them. Thus is it, that on the most momentous of all subjects—on the first principle of all true religion—we are secured against the danger of running, on the one hand, into cold philosophical abstractions ; and on the other, into gross conceptions, into low, unworthy, and debasing practices. But in order to gain this security, in order to avail ourselves of this, our lofty privilege, it becomes necessary to dwell, with fixed attention, on the Gospel narratives ; and to contemplate with steadfast eye, the adorable Person and the wonderful actions of the Son of God, who was also the Son of man. We must form the habit of listening, with a quick, intelligent and willing ear, to His engaging eloquence. We must take pains to trace His unwearied footsteps, in His journeyings of charity through Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee. We must observe, and, in observing, pause to admire, the ever wakeful activity of His beneficence, the mild majesty of His demeanour, the firmness of His patience, the simplicity, the beauty, the practical wisdom and powerful efficiency of the lessons which he taught. Then are the *hearts* of His faithful followers most likely to *burn* within them, to glow with a devout and holy satisfaction in what they have already learned, and with an eager curiosity to learn yet more—when ‘ He,’ through the medium of the Gospels, as it were, again ‘ talks with them by the way, and opens to them the Scriptures.’ Through that medium especially are we invited and encouraged to ‘ make ourselves acquainted with God, and be at peace.’ By becoming familiar with those scenes, in which the Incarnate Word relieved the wants, soothed the sorrows, and entered into the secret thoughts and feelings of the companions and hearers, by whom He was surrounded, are we to gain a just conception—a conception that can be applied and used—of the goodness, the omnipresence and the all-pervading influence of God. The soft and tender tones of mercy, which, in the Gospels, pronounce the sentence of forgiveness of sins—the uncomplaining, yet touching notices therein preserved, of trials undergone, of contumely borne, of privation and sufferings endured, for the sake, not of the meek and merciful Redeemer Himself, but of sinners, wayward and perverse—His persecutors and His murderers ; these are intended and well calculated to convey to our inmost souls a lively hope of reconciliation with God, even for ourselves, to be effected by the interference of ‘ the one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. By us the precepts of the Divine Law are to be understood, as they are graciously interpreted in the Discourses of our Lord ; and to be obeyed, as they are in the same Discourses enforced by the most cogent motives, the most

persuasive addresses to each feeling of admiration, gratitude, and love. In the prayers, which He offered to His Father ; above all, in that hallowed form of prayer, which He prescribed for the use of His disciples, we are to learn the duty and privilege of prayer. When He speaks at once of the omniscience and the omnipotence of God, and of the absolute necessity of prayer—when He thus combines the attributes of God and the duty of man, which a short-sighted philosophy has often deemed irreconcilable with each other—we are called to remember and to confess that we are listening to a Teacher, who speaks as one having authority and not as the Scribes ; that as ‘the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father,’ He has in this instance, ‘declared the Father,’ explained His dealings, and given an account of His dispensations.”—pp. 12—16.

We have given this extract at some length, not only for the correctness of the views expressed in it, but also because we think it a fair specimen of the lucid and succinct style of the writer. The plan which, in the sequel, Mr. Ogilvie marks out for himself in accordance with the design of his work, embraces in the first place, the consideration of the Miracles of our Lord. This subject is discussed in the second and third Lectures. The fourth and fifth are occupied [in an examination of the Parables, which our Lord delivered or expounded. The sixth treats of our Lord’s intercourse with Publicans and sinners. The seventh, of our Lord’s guidance of such as sincerely sought instruction. And the eighth, of our Lord’s demeanour to His chosen companions.

The remarks with which Mr. Ogilvie, in his second Lecture, introduces the consideration of our Lord’s miracles, are most valuable. They comprise a clear statement of the merits of a question, which not unfrequently has been perplexed and mystified by the supporters, as well as by the adversaries, of the Christian faith ; and show in what manner, and to what extent, the force of the argument from miracles applies. The miracles of Christ prove the Divine commission and sanction of Him who wrought them, and are sufficient to establish beyond reasonable doubt, the truth of the testimony which Nicodemus was constrained to render unto Him, that He was “a teacher come from God.” Beyond this, however, their evidence taken singly and by itself, does not reach. They do not, as some reasoners upon this department of evidence have affirmed, supply a direct and immediate proof of the Divine Nature of Christ. That is to be sought for in the teaching of Christ ; in the assertions which He made of Himself ; in the doctrines which He proposed to man’s acceptance. And when we find those assertions unequivocally repeated, those doctrines solemnly enforced, then it is that the miracles are found to be so conclusive in giving the weight of their authority to the truth of Christ’s words. In this sense, they afford, though *indirect* and

mediate, yet valid and decisive proofs of His proper Divinity; and exhibit to us the working of “a power not *imparted* but *essential*; not *supernatural* merely, but *Almighty*.”—p. 39. It is this want of discrimination as to the real nature and weight of the evidence supplied by our Lord's miracles,—the regarding them as a *direct* rather than an *indirect* proof of His Divinity,—with which Arnobius, the celebrated Christian Apologist, who lived at the beginning of the fourth century, and other writers of the same age, are chargeable. But with this reservation, it would not be easy to find more faultless reasoning, or more eloquent and heart-stirring appeals than those which occur in the first book of Arnobius—*Adversus Gentes*, upon the copiousness and force of this branch of evidence. Mr. Ogilvie has made some extracts from the work in question, with reference to this point, which fully bear out the eulogy which he bestows upon it.

And here we would take the opportunity of remarking it as one of the peculiar advantages to be derived from the attentive perusal of this volume, that not only does the general reader meet with materials of the most needful interest and instructive consolation in the Lectures themselves, but the younger members of the clerical profession and candidates for holy orders, (who, be it remembered, formed the majority of the congregation before whom they were delivered,) are further invited, by a judicious selection of extracts from some of the best authorities of the Church, both of ancient and recent date, and by short and valuable critical annotations upon the same, to receive, and follow, and profit by the guidance of, their fathers in the faith. They are not called upon to enter rashly and unadvisedly into an unbounded region, whose vastness might bewilder the imagination, or whose ruggedness might weary and baffle and appal the intellect; but definite and reasonable limits in each department of inquiry are laid down, and a clear and safe path marked out for them to traverse. The works upon which, by repeated references, Mr. Ogilvie is anxious to fix the attention, and to employ as instruments in acquiring a more intimate acquaintance with the best of the Greek and Latin fathers, are those of Bishop Bull, and the *Reliquiæ Sacræ* of the venerable President of Magdalen College, Oxford. The extracts from Arnobius, in fact, which have led to these remarks, are contained in the selection which that revered scholar and theologian, Dr. Routh, has drawn up from the writings of the Fathers, and which he has entitled *Opuscula quædam Selecta Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*.

But to return to the consideration of our Lord's miracles. Mr. Ogilvie is most anxious that their full and proper character, as forming one of the prominent and enduring evidences of Chris-

tian belief, should be borne in mind ; and that, like every other kind of evidence which addresses the understanding, and requires and receives its assent upon distinct and intelligible grounds, they should be thoroughly and impartially investigated. For however true it may be, that to some persons the evidence, which is called *internal*, appears to afford a sufficient support for the cause of our holy religion ; and however freely it may be conceded yet further, that this unquestioning faith, this simple-hearted reliance upon the truth of God's word, as it is the fruit of early nurturing in the admonition of the Lord, so in many instances it may supersede the anxiety and labours of investigation in other departments of inquiry, and even regard the prosecution of such inquiries as mere "weariness of the flesh ;" it must nevertheless be remembered, that the revelation of the Almighty is addressed to the whole world, to men of different capacities and dispositions, of different attainments and pursuits ; and, therefore, to all men must be afforded the opportunities of ascertaining and verifying, as far as they are able, the grounds on which their belief is demanded. The interests of immortal souls, the awful realities of the divine counsels, involve interests too diversified and too momentous to be left to the vague and fluctuating opinions of imagination or fancy. The ground on every side must be carefully explored ; every material of instruction and aid must be thankfully gathered in, and a permanent provision made for satisfying the wants and securing the conviction of every impartial inquirer. Hence the value of those accumulated stores which the labour and research and piety of centuries have compiled ; and hence the importance of gaining an intimate and experimental knowledge of their rich and abundant treasures.

The miraculous facts, then, recorded in the history of our Lord having been allowed, having served their proper ends of evidence, and having assisted in establishing upon separate grounds, which Mr. Ogilvie assumes as already settled and proved, the great doctrine of our Lord's divinity,—he proceeds, in accordance with his proposed design, to point out the indications of that blessed truth which are afforded by the narratives of the four Evangelists. And here he takes a comprehensive yet accurate survey of the merciful and gracious works of our Lord ; reminding the reader of that which he is sometimes apt to overlook, that, however mighty and wonderful and diversified may be the miracles which are minutely recorded in the Gospels, there are yet many more very briefly and summarily reported, and others that have not been recorded at all (see John, xx. 30, 31.) He points out not only the *number* and *variety* of those which are detailed, but also that which gives the strongest indication of the point at issue,

the tone of independent authority which marked their accomplishment, and the *knowledge* by which they are accompanied; and shows in the last place, by a clear and convincing train of induction,—of which we are only sorry that want of space prevents us from giving some of the most striking particulars,—that, when regarded as the interpositions of God in the person of his Son, they are calculated to gain and keep a firmer hold upon the heart and its affections than any miracles of created and inferior beings. The following is part of the conclusion of the third Lecture, wherein he sums up the blessings which result from the faithful contemplation of this portion of the sacred narratives.

“Through the scenes of the Gospel history we form a lively image of God present in the world, which by His word He created, and which by the same word He governs; those scenes we learn to represent to our minds, as if we had ourselves been spectators of them; and by our Lord’s own authority, we are encouraged to believe that we have in them a deep and lasting interest. He is not, indeed, a man accessible to men; for His extraordinary interference in our behalf we are not, in any case, warranted in looking; but we discover that among the ends to be answered by the record of His miracles, one was to teach us that we may depend on His ever-present, although secret and unseen aid, that we may be persuaded of His sympathy with our sufferings, both mental and bodily, that we may perceive how He enters into the particulars of our condition, makes gracious allowance for the difficulties that beset us in our way to heaven, pities our errors and pardons our sins. The abodes which He blessed with His presence were, like our own homes, darkened by sorrow and defiled with sin, and He chose to enter them for the benevolent purpose of banishing sorrow and counteracting sin, the baneful cause and the prolific parent of sorrow. It is in short our exalted privilege, by gaining an intimate acquaintance with the particulars, even of the miracles of the Gospel history, to realize the presence of God with ourselves, and to encourage a firm expectation of help and strength from His sustaining influence. While we are permitted to see the Son in His deeds of united power and mercy, we shall thankfully own that we have seen the Father also; and the bright but softened beams of that glorious vision will for us dispel the clouds, which must otherwise have hidden from our view the supreme source of truth and purity.”—pp. 84—86.

The next branch of Mr. Ogilvie’s subject, perhaps the most interesting in the whole volume, is that of the Parables of our Lord; and here, as in the former instance, his design “is limited to indirect, and, as it were, incidental notices and illustrations of the divine nature of Jesus Christ.”—p. 88. And after having made some remarks upon the meaning of the word “Parable,” and shown that our Lord did not employ that mode of teaching until after the expiration of the first year of his ministry, he goes to consider the reasons which the Gospel history affords for

his having then resorted to it. He traces the wisdom and the goodness of Christ which they develope; and argues at some length, and with great caution and clearness, upon the causes for which the meaning of some of those parables which He addressed to the impenitent and stubborn Jews was concealed from them. In comparing the records of St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke with reference to this point, he adopts the obviously sound and reasonable ground of interpretation, which estimates "the testimony of the less explicit, the less circumstantial and the less positive among the Evangelists, altogether in conformity with the testimony of the more so." And hence, taking St. Matthew, chap. xiii. 10—17 for his guide, who relates our Saviour's quotation of and reasoning upon Isaiah's memorable prophecy, c. vi. 9, 10, more at length than either of the others, he justly determines the scope and meaning of its declaration in that passage, and infers that,

"A mode of expression, which at first sounds like a statement of the final cause, is, in truth, to be understood in a milder sense, and implies no more than that between our Lord's chosen method of teaching, and that moral condition of his hearers, which the Prophet had long before described, there was a designed correspondence; in other words, that the former fitted and suited, and was meant to fit and suit, the latter."—pp. 103, 104.

The fact therefore of our Lord's occasionally hiding under the veil of parable the saving truths which fell from His lips, was precisely analogous to the case of His miracles, which, wheresoever they were despised and resisted, only made yet more emphatic, and aggravated the condemnation of those who refused to know the things that belonged unto their peace. Mr. Ogilvie corroborates this analogy, by showing that the Evangelist St. John, c. xii. 37—40, introduces the very same quotation from Isaiah in connection with our Lord's *miracles*, which the other three Evangelists had stated that He Himself applied to the subject of His *parables*. And just in the same manner as the consideration of the words so applied by the Disciple whom Jesus loved, would not warrant any man in supposing that the inability of the Jews to believe was "superinduced and caused, in order that the prediction of the Prophet might be accomplished; still less that the miracles in question were wrought with a view to the end of incredulity on the part of those who should witness them"—p. 109: so must the similar language of St. Mark and and St. Luke be understood with regard to *parables*. "It was the object of both these Evangelists, in perfect agreement with St. Matthew, to point out a twofold fulfilment of a remarkable passage of the prophetic volume, as that passage related

on the one hand to the moral condition of the hearers of the Messiah, and on the other, to the peculiar manner of instruction which he adopted."—p. 110.

It will be seen by those who are acquainted with Mr. Greswell's *Dissertations on the Harmony of the Gospels*, that the view which Mr. Ogilvie has taken of the parallel passages referred to in his fourth Lecture, is different from the one adopted in that valuable work. In fact, the Bampton Lecturer alludes to this difference of interpretation existing between Mr. Greswell and himself, not only in this particular instance, but also with regard to the general view taken of this part of his subject in Mr. Greswell's subsequent work, "*The Exposition of the Parables and other parts of the Gospels*." As far as the principle of interpretation is concerned to which Mr. Ogilvie has expressed his adherence, and which we have quoted above, it is the very same which is laid down by Mr. Greswell himself in the twelfth dissertation of his second work on the *Harmony of the Gospels*; and, therefore, unless he is prepared to show that the conclusion drawn from his own principle is incorrect, he must be considered as having furnished an argument against himself. But we are not going to enter into any dispute upon this question. We have already said that it is the object of Mr. Ogilvie's work to promote an uncontroversial study of the Gospels, and we therefore shall not mar that object by attempting to stir a controversy. No persons can entertain a more high opinion than we sincerely do of "the talents and learning and industry which have been consecrated by Mr. Greswell to the service of the Church." These are Mr. Ogilvie's own words in noticing the difference between them, and we most cordially subscribe to this testimony. At the same time we do not hesitate to say, that we think much of the value of Mr. Greswell's *Exposition of the Parables* is impaired by his excessive refinement in explaining every minute particular belonging to what he designates their material circumstances. "To attempt to make every thing emphatic," says Archbishop Whately in his *Treatise on Rhetoric*, "is to make nothing emphatic;" or, to use another illustration of that prelate in the same work, "is like setting down in the map of a country not only the principal rivers and towns and mountains, but also every village and hillock and streamlet in the land, which, if they were all inserted in their due proportions, would only crowd the map, though after all they could not be discerned without a microscope."

We stop not to show how this hair-splitting kind of commentary militates against the acknowledged principles of sound scriptural interpretation; such principles, for example, as are so ad-

mirably developed in the Bampton Lectures of the late Mr. Conybeare, and the lamented Bishop Van Mildert: but we will merely venture to offer one case in point, of that which we consider an over-curious refinement in the exposition of a Parable, and contrast it with the view taken of the same circumstance by another writer, who, as we think, was less diverted from looking to the plain, simple, and edifying application of the passage. The case to which we refer, is that of the number of the Wise and Foolish Virgins. Mr. Greswell's words are these:—

“The number of the wise itself is supposed to be equal to that of the foolish: a supposition, which may be due partly to the decorum of character, requisite to be observed in the narrative—since, out of the same company of young women in general, had the amount of the wise been greater than that of the foolish, it might have appeared inconsistent with the natural thoughtlessness of the sex, and partly to the necessity of the case—since, if the number of the wise had been less than the number of the foolish, the bride might have been left, in the end, without a decent retinue of attendants.”—*Greswell's Exposition of the Parables*. Vol. v. P. i. p. 461.

Now to our minds, the way in which Dr. Townson alludes to the same circumstance in his admirable sermon on the manner of our Saviour's teaching, is much more just and beautiful. He considers it as an instance of the compassionate charity of the Redeemer, which “is as favourable in its supposition as the case will admit; and so tempers its zeal to alarm and rouse the wicked, that it may not terrify and dishearten the well-disposed.”

“We may observe (says he), that where the case did not demand severity, there is a great *lenity of supposition* in the state of our Lord's Parables. The wise virgins are as many as the foolish. In the Parable of the ten talents, we find two good and faithful, and only one unprofitable servant. At the marriage feast, only one of a large assembly is represented as wanting a wedding garment.”—*Townson's Works*, vol. i. p. 284, 285.

Of the Sermon from which the above extracts are made, Mr. Ogilvie says very justly, that, if by its means any reader should be induced to make himself acquainted with the other writings of that excellent author, he will have reason to be thankful for this reference.

We find it difficult to leave this part of our view of Mr. Ogilvie's volume, without placing before our readers, in his own words, this description of our Lord's Parables.

“Are we not conscious that these are portions of Holy Scripture, on which we dwell with a lingering fondness, to which we recur with never-failing interest—in which we find engagement without weariness, and instruction without offence? when in early childhood, we, like Samuel,

' did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto us,' these winning narratives had power to fix our attention ; and by them we were gently and gradually brought to distinguish the voice of God, calling us, from that loved voice of parental or pastoral authority, with which for a while we innocently confounded it. The same passages of the Holy Gospels have formed the entertainment and the solace of our riper manhood ; and we expect that they will become for ourselves, what we find that they have been and are for many around us, the source of refreshment and of mental vigour in declining years.

" It is moreover from the Parables of our blessed Lord especially that we learn the true philosophy of Morals. They furnish principles of action, rather than precise and definite rules of conduct. Whilst they are far removed from the stiffness and formality of burdensome and tedious directions for the minute details of daily behaviour, they stand equally distant from the vague and inapplicable generalities of abstract theory. Their lessons spring out of the relations, events and circumstances of real life—of that life, which we ourselves are living—but the life, of which they draw the striking picture, is for the most part stripped of local and temporary peculiarities ; if such peculiarities are ever allowed to remain, they impart only an additional interest when they are observed ; and have scarcely a perceptible influence, in rendering the proper practical influences less easy or less perspicuous for men of every age, and every country. Retaining each tender and touching association to which our common nature is alive, they yet condescend to nothing low, they are disfigured by no shade of coarseness, they offer no repulsive features. In short, it may be truly said that, wherever the Holy Gospels have been—wherever they shall be read and studied, the Parables, contained in them, have served and will serve to exalt our *Lord the Saviour Jesus Christ*, as a Moral Teacher, above all who have hitherto appeared in that character. His vast superiority in this respect cannot establish—is not alleged to prove—the doctrine of His Divine Nature. But it is in perfect harmony with that doctrine, which it in some sort confirms, and by which it is itself illustrated and explained.—pp. 111—113.

Of the remaining three Lectures, we are constrained to content ourselves with a very brief notice. And yet, in the sixth, which treats of our Lord's intercourse with publicans and sinners, there is a passage which bears so directly upon the proper course to be pursued by his disciples, in their intercourse with the world, and which, if duly followed out, might be found equally efficacious to restrain the presumption of the rash, and the misgivings of the timid, that we do not scruple to give it to the utmost length which our limits will allow.

" The declared purpose of Christ's coming into the world, was to call sinners to repentance—and for the accomplishment of his purpose, He possessed the high qualifications of freedom from all sin and of a nature not liable to its contagion. Our lowlier destiny is to undergo a course

of discipline and of probation, that may repair the ruins of our fallen state, aid the natural weakness of our moral powers, and impart to our oft-repeated efforts the fixedness and constancy of virtuous habits ; and it is in the fulfilment of this, our own destiny, that we are, each one of us, in his proper station, expected and required to contribute by our example and influence, towards the improvement of our fellow-creatures. With a view to their improvement, it is manifest that we must hold intercourse with them : but then only can we carry on such intercourse profitably to others and without disadvantage for ourselves, when we remember that it is by no means free from danger. Occasions will arise, when we may well shudder for our safety ; nor among the least perilous will be those, into which we may have been led by a sincere and honest desire to do good ; and upon which we may have entered with a firm resolution to maintain our own principles. From occasions of this sort it will be the part of prudence sometimes to retire, lest our own weakness, mistaken for the call of duty, expose us unnecessarily to “the wicked who lay wait, as he that setteth snares, who set a trap and catch men.’ But if escape from the position of danger be impossible ; if the retreat, which prudence recommends, be not practicable, then may we hope to be secure from injury, even in the midst of danger ; and one of the best means of security we shall find in a steady and devout contemplation of our Lord and Saviour, holding intercourse with sinners for their welfare, and never, for one moment, unmindful in their company, of the sole end, which He proposed. His holy example, thus seasonably present to our minds, will exert a powerful influence ; and will moreover, prompt an earnest prayer, which He will vouchsafe to hear and answer, that His ‘ grace may be sufficient for us—that His strength may be made perfect in our weakness.’ ”—pp.151—153.

In the seventh Lecture, which treats of our Lord’s guidance of such as sincerely sought instruction from Him, and in the eighth, which is on our Lord’s demeanour towards His chosen companions, we would gladly stop if it were possible, and dwell upon the many valuable suggestions which Mr. Ogilvie has pointed out. Those particularly which relate to the real character of Christian friendship, are as just as they are beautiful, and show that the intercourse of our Saviour with His followers upon earth, abounding as it did with proofs and instances of the tenderest sympathy and love, “ was yet marked by striking indications of His superiority, of His essential dignity and glory.” “ God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.” No longer sheltered in a cleft of the rock, the disciples beheld, and we, as it were, with open face may still behold “ the Lord passing by and proclaiming, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.” Although our Great High Priest, Jesus, the Son of God, is passed into the heavens, although having “ offered one

sacrifice for sins, He hath for ever sat down at the right hand of God:" Yet is He in His glorified human nature capable of being touched with the feeling of our infirmities;" and in the same nature does He "ever live to make intercession for those that come unto God by Him."—pp. 224, 225.

And here we take our leave of Mr. Ogilvie. We feel that we have been walking with a safe guide, with a faithful and wise friend; and we would fain render to him our grateful acknowledgment for the valuable addition which he has made to the theology of our church and country. We only wish that he could be prevailed upon to repeat in some other form the benefit which, as an author, he has it in his power to bestow. If there be a defect arising from the calm and retired habits of reflection, whereby he has been enabled, with humility and thoughtfulness, to trace in the Gospel history such clear and convincing indications of the essential glory of Christ's Godhead; it is, that he has been led hitherto to stand too far aloof from the actual collision of mind and feeling which others have to encounter in publishing their opinions to the world. The patient philosopher is the first to feel the real ignorance which encumbers him. The profound and experienced jurist is the first to discern the difficulties which seem as nothing to those who possess not his sagacity; and so the deliberate and cautious reasoner, the devout and humble inquirer into the counsels of God and man, is the first to see the perils and the snares which arise from the hasty and forward desire to determine and dogmatize upon the things that are in heaven and earth. But yet, if he do not stand forward, who is there that shall repress the insolent, sustain the weak, or teach the ignorant in the days of rebuke and trouble? Such are the days in which we live. The influence of the wise and good, then, must not be confined to the circle of private friendship or of social conference, valuable as that influence may be, and dearly as those who share in it may prize its worth. They must enter upon wider fields of enterprize, make bolder ventures for the cause of truth; and assuredly the hearts of those who look up to them for help will thankfully receive it, and wish them God speed.

ART. V.—*An Elementary Course of Theological Lectures, in Three Parts.* Delivered in Bristol College. By the Rev. W. D. Conybeare, M.A. F.R.S. Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, &c. &c., Visitor of the College. London: Sherwood, Gilbert, and Piper. 1836. pp. 509. 12mo.

THE appearance of a second edition of this work impresses us with a feeling at once of satisfaction and of shame; of satisfaction, that we may congratulate the author on the success of his publication; of shame, that we have hitherto neglected to point out the merits of that publication to our readers. In its present shape, the work is improved as to its outward aspect, and some valuable additions have been made to its contents. It is partly, indeed, a new production: and on that account, among others, we cannot bring ourselves to pass it over in silence. At the same time, we have no intention of saying much: first, because the very fact of a fresh and enlarged edition shows that these lectures have been widely read and rightly estimated; and, secondly, because the comprehensive range of their subject-matter would render a detailed review almost interminable; while, as being a summary or conspectus in their intrinsic character, they utterly defy a summary or conspectus of themselves.

They were originally composed by Mr. Conybeare in his capacity of Visitor of the Bristol College, and delivered to the Collegiate Class “*as a manual and manuduction*” of theological study in the years 1831, 1832, and 1833. We have no room to enter upon any discussion concerning the design of the College, or the principles on which it has been founded. These Lectures of the Visitor are at least one signal proof of some benefit arising from the Institution. Their general nature and tendency will be best learnt from Mr. Conybeare’s own words.

“With reference to the more immediate occasion of the course of Theological Lectures, of which a new edition is now submitted to the public, it is only necessary to premise the following short notice. It having been considered desirable to found at Bristol a Collegiate Institution for superior education, it was determined to place that establishment on the most extensively useful and liberal basis; and, therefore, impartial admission to all the advantages it offers was conceded, without distinction, to the members of different religious communities. At the same time, a large portion of the Council (being members of the Established Church) felt it their duty in no manner to neglect the providing sufficient means for the religious instruction of the Pupils belonging to the same in the tenets of that Church. To this effect the Seventh Article of the general constitution of the College declares,

"That the Institution shall be open to Students of all religious denominations without preference or distinction; but that it shall be competent to a committee, consisting of those members of the Council who are also members of the Church of England, to institute lectures and provide instruction in Theology, under such regulations as they shall determine on." To carry the latter part of this Article into effect, a special committee has been accordingly organized, and has adopted the following Resolutions.

' That the course of Theological Instruction be conducted according to the following outline:—

' 1.—The evidence and doctrine of natural religion, as deduced by inference from the works of nature, from the phenomena of the human mind, and from the circumstances of mankind. The text-books of this part of the course may be the works of Derham and Paley on Natural Theology, and the Analogy of Bishop Butler.

' 2.—The evidences of Christianity; taking as text-books the works of Paley, Chalmers, and Less, on this subject.

' 3.—A brief survey of biblical criticism, upon the basis of the lectures and translations of Bishop Marsh, or at least the second volume of the Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures by the Rev. Hartwell Horne.

' 4.—Scriptural Archæology, with sacred and Ecclesiastical History.

' 5.—The doctrines of the Church of England.

' 6.—The most important principles relative to Church Discipline.

' The course, or any of the sections, will be open to all students who may feel disposed to attend; and examinations on the subject of each section will take place periodically.'—pp. ix. x.

On each of these six departments, with the exception of the last, and that part of the fourth which relates to Ecclesiastical History, Mr. Conybeare's work compresses into a short compass much of accurate thought and solid information. We, therefore, the more regret the omissions which we have mentioned; and especially, because it happens that Ecclesiastical History and Church Discipline are two subjects, which are now rising, day after day, into greater and greater importance; and on which it is essentially necessary that Churchmen should form just and moderate and consistent views, under the direction, if it were possible, of a guide so well qualified for the office as Mr. Conybeare. But we ought to be too thankful for his production as it is, even to pay him the somewhat equivocal compliment of wishing that it had been more extensive.

The whole work is written in a spirit candid and liberal, amiable and charitable, not certainly to a fault, but perhaps to a disadvantage. The tone is so uniformly,—we by no means say indiscriminately—laudatory, that the parties eulogized may attach less honour to commendations which they share in common with so many: and the value even of Mr. Conybeare's praise

may be somewhat depreciated by the large quantity of it which he has put at once in circulation. Yet how well does such a circumstance speak for the moral elements of the bestower-of the panegyrics: and, as for the intellectual, Mr. Conybeare is a man of so much learning and ability, that he can afford, at the sacrifice, perhaps, of some of his own just claims to originality, to bestow the amplest tribute of glory and applause upon his predecessors or contemporaries in any of the paths which his investigations have pursued.

These paths are wide and various. Mr. Conybeare is almost equally conversant with things old and new. He displays an unostentatious familiarity with the most ancient learning and the most modern; with sciences the most venerable in their sacred age, or the most recent in their fresh and vigorous youth. In one section, he dives into the mines of a remote antiquity, and tracks the footmarks of that knowledge, which is to be called, it appears, *archæology*, as it relates to the works of man, and *palæontology*, as it relates to the works of nature. In another, he reasons upon the yesterday's discovery of the comparative anatomist, or the latest emendations of the Biblical critic. Yet the bent of his genius, we should say, rather leads him to exact and objective, than to speculative or subjective philosophy. To expatiate amidst cosmical phenomena; to examine dynamical or mathematical theories; to bend over the experiments of the electrician and the chemist; or to disinter geological truths out of their primeval burial places, to dig them from that vast and regal pyramid in which they have been so long entombed, the earth itself,—and, at the same time, to enlist all these departments of knowledge into the service of religion natural and revealed, to form them into another bulwark of the Gospel, to draw down the worlds above us, and bring up the remnants of the world beneath, as fresh arguments in favour of Christianity,—this, probably, is his favourite task: and although the matter of this division of Mr. Conybeare's lecture has been expanded,—not superseded,—in the Bridgewater Treatises, his part, nevertheless, is excellently done. Yet, if from the native tendencies of his mind, he would dwell most on physical researches, the arcana of the earth, and the mighty mechanism of the majestic heavens, it would be most unjust to insinuate that he has overlooked the wonderful analogies which lie imbedded in the universe of mind as well as of matter; or that he has not been fully alive to the profound and superhuman wisdom of the metaphysical principles on which Christianity is based.

There is another department of knowledge, in which we are largely indebted to the Theological Lectures of Mr. Conybeare;

we mean the department of Oriental scholarship. On this point, with assuredly not more than a just consciousness of the importance of his labours, he says himself in the preface,

“ I would wish to add a few words concerning one digression, which might otherwise be considered as a somewhat irrelevant interpolation in a course of Theological Lectures; I mean the insertion, as an Appendix to the philological and critical part of the Course, of a detailed Essay on the Grammatical Principles of the Hebrew and kindred Oriental Tongues. Deeply impressed with the importance of an acquaintance with those tongues, and earnestly desirous to see this considered as an essential branch of theological instruction, I felt it desirable, in presenting this volume to my collegiate class, to accompany it with some contribution tending to facilitate their acquisition of an attainment which I had so warmly recommended to their attention. I felt convinced also that much light might be thrown on a subject often regarded as obscure, and much interest excited in a pursuit too commonly neglected as dry, by applying the general grammatical principles elicited by that careful examination of the mechanism of different languages which constitutes the true science of Comparative Philology. This science, which involves the whole philosophy of language, has been warmly and successfully cultivated by the Germans, undoubtedly the most learned of nations, but has been unaccountably neglected in this island, where, with the exception of the late universal Dr. Young, and my almost equally active friend Dr. Pritchard, I have scarcely known any persons who have devoted to this most important subject the attention it deserves.*

“ As I have endeavoured to introduce as many of the general principles and most striking results of this science as possible in a condensed form, it seems probable that these parts of my essay may present views perfectly novel to the greater part of my readers; and if I may judge of other minds from my own, those views can scarcely fail to open a new and rich source of interest. The plan pursued in the concluding portion of this essay is, I believe, perfectly original; I mean the application of the mathematical doctrine of probabilities to the investigation of the question, to what extent the coincidences detected between different languages can be fairly attributed to casual resemblance, and to what point they become satisfactory evidence of original connexion. I need not add, that whenever such mathematical reasoning can be applied, it affords the only means of rendering doubt absurd and dissent ridiculous.”—pp. xiv—xvi.

* It will be remembered that I am here speaking of systematic writers on *comparative Philology*;—for in the more particular branches of Philology, especially in the Oriental tongues, England has just reason to be proud of the most distinguished names—*e. g.* In Sanscrit, Wilkins, Colebrooke, Wilson, Naughton; in Hinduwee, Marshman and Carey; in Hebrew, Arabic and Persian, Lee and Lumsden; in Chinese, Morrison; in Pali, Hough; in Malay, Marsden; and a host of other labourers, who have done much, though they may not have attained the eminent standard of the above.”

In the Appendix itself, Mr. Conybeare states, at the commencement of his remarks on the Hebrew and Arabic grammars,

“ The primary object of this publication being the instruction of a collegiate class, I have conceived that it would form a useful Appendix to the observations contained in this Philological portion of our lectures on the importance of the study of the Oriental dialects, and the facility of their acquisition, to subjoin a few brief remarks; which appear to me likely materially to abridge the labours of the student, and to remove those preliminary difficulties which would otherwise embarrass him at the very entrance.

“ I. And, first, of the Alphabet.—The difficulties of seizing a new alphabetical type would be at once overcome, were the student apprised *in limine* that the Hebrew letters were in fact only a varied form of the very same characters which the Greeks borrowed from the Phœnicians; and with which he is, therefore, already perfectly familiar. The series of letters employed as numeral signs, which correspond throughout in both languages, sufficiently demonstrates this: and although the Greeks subsequently discontinued the alphabetic use of three of the Phœnician characters, they still retained them in their proper places as arithmetical *ἐπίσημα*, with their Oriental names.

“ The ancient Hebrew character, as exhibited in the shekels of Jerusalem, and still preserved by the descendants of the Samaritans, is in fact nearly identical in form with the Greek, if written facing to the left, as in the alternate lines of the ancient *βοιωτοφῆδον* inscriptions. The Hebrews adopted their more modern character from the Chaldæans, after the Captivity; and this character is itself formed from the older, disguised by a fuller and blacker mode of writing,—just as the black Gothic character was formed from the Roman.”—pp. 247, 248.

Then follows a comparative alphabet in Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, which every scholar will do well to consult, as also the succeeding considerations on the elemental roots, nouns, verbs, and general affinities of the Semitic Languages. We subjoin a specimen, which has reference to the pronouns; not because it is more worthy of attention, but simply because it is much shorter, than the observations on the other parts of speech.

“ In Hebrew and Arabic the personal pronouns yield abbreviated derivative suffixes, which serve as their substitutes in construction; forming, if joined to the prefixed particles denoting the relations of case, the cases of the pronouns; if appended to nouns, the possessive pronouns; and if appended to verbs, their pronominal accusatives. The personal inflections of the verbs are also considered as abbreviated from the pronouns, but are much altered from the common suffixes; of which latter alone we shall treat in this article, reserving our observations on the personal inflections for the article on verbs.

“ A similar system of abbreviated pronominal suffixes is common to very many of the most unconnected languages; *e. g.* to the vast

Malayan family of tongues in the Indian seas and Pacific, and to the Esquimaux, and dialects extending from the great lakes to Delaware in North America. We may consider it to have been common to the ruder form of most languages; for, although it does not prevail in the most polished dialects of the Indo-European family,—viz. the Sanscrit,* Greek and Latin, Slavonic and Teutonic, in all which the grammatical structure is most elaborately refined; yet in the branch of this Asiatic race, which from its position appears to have quitted the parent stock at the earliest period, and to have been driven to the furthest West by the successive waves of the great tide of emigration, namely, in the Celtic dialects (as exemplified in the Welsh), we find the grammatical structure, as might have been expected, much simpler. And here also we discover the system of abbreviated pronominal suffixes, which are employed as governed by prepositions, and which also, under the same identical form, constitute the persons of the verbs. Yet it may be most clearly demonstrated that the Welsh belongs to the Sanscrit or Indo-European, and not to the Hebrew or Semitic class of languages. But these *intermediate* analogies of grammatical structure are exactly what we should expect to find in an earlier offset, which must have left the great central cradle of our race at a period before the differences of the great classes of dialects could have become so strongly marked, as subsequently to have almost obliterated every trace of a common origin; of which, however, remote vestiges may still be detected, though by no means of a nature to be confounded with that close analogy of grammatical structure which pervades what have been well called the great *families* of languages; such as the Indo-European on the one side, and the Semitic on the other.”—pp. 267, 268.

On the question of general affinities we must firmly deny ourselves the gratification of inserting more than a single quotation.

“ We may recognise the following subdivisions of the Semitic mother tongue. 1. Aramaic, spoken by the posterity of Aram, the fifth son of Shem, who occupied the countries bordering upon the Euphrates and Tigris. This was again subdivided into two dialects,—*a*. the Eastern Aramaic, spoken on the north of Mesopotamia, and extending to Babylon; a dialect falsely called the Chaldæan, inasmuch as the Chaldæans, though on the dissolution of the first Assyrian empire they occupied Babylonia, appear to have been a race of foreign conquerors; —*b*. the Western Aramaic or Syrian, ranging to the south-west of the Euphrates. 2. The dialect of the Canaanites and Phœnicians. The only fragment of this still preserved is the specimen of its Punic or Carthaginian daughter, exhibited in one of the plays of Plautus, the *Pœnulus*, which has been satisfactorily arranged by Bochart, and the first line of which will be found in the note beneath.† 3. The Hebrew. 4. The Arabic. 5. The Æthiopic of Abyssinia.”—284, 285.

* “ It should be mentioned, however, that a similar system of abbreviated possessive pronominal suffixes does partially prevail in the Persian; where it is, however, confined to the singular number; the suffix *M* denoting *my*; *T*, *thy*; and *S*, *his* or *her*.”

† “ Ten lines are given together with a Latin translation in the *Pœnulus*; but the first will afford a sufficient proof of the language being Semitic, for this place. This,

The postscript, however, "*on the application of the doctrine of Chances to determine how far the Coincidences of language may be properly regarded as accidental*," appears to us so exceedingly curious that, long as our citation would be, we should be glad to present it entire. But our aim is rather to stimulate than to satisfy a not undevout inquisitiveness. Let it suffice then to state, that Mr. Conybeare first endeavours to determine, by an ingenious induction, the probable number of combinations, and then dexterously applies to them the mathematical analysis. He takes different cases; 1st. the "*application of the Doctrine of Chances to solve the question, How many accidental Coincidences may be expected to occur between any two Languages?*" His solution of this problem is as follows:

"From the preceding investigation it should appear that we may fairly assume 512 as a sufficient approximation to the number of elementary literal combinations, and 2000 as the verbal roots or primary terms which languages must express by their means; and from these data we shall proceed to institute our calculations, only observing, in the first place, that if any one should consider these approximations as erroneously assumed, it will be easy to substitute such corrections as may be supposed necessary. The advantage of the method pursued in reducing the question from loose and vague generalizations to precise and definite statement, and of subjecting it to that test of mathematical reasoning which can alone lead to solid conclusions on any argument involving probability, must still remain incontrovertible. In order, then, thus to subject to calculation the question, How many accidental coincidences may be expected between any two mother tongues,—*e. g.* the Semitic and Indo-European classes—we may proceed as follows.

"These two languages having each 512 literal roots, with which they

according to the reading of Lambinus's edition, is, "Ny th Alonim v Alonuth ai corath ismacon sith," which Plautus himself translates, "Deos Deasque veneror, qui hanc urbem colunt." Now if we read it *Hebraicè*;

נא את עליונים ועליונות שקרת יסמכך זות

which, if read with points as in the Hexapla, will be, "Na eth Elionim v Elionuth sechorath ismecun zoth;" and the literal translation will be, "Rogo Deos Deasque, qui hanc urbem sustinent." Here the terminations of the masculine and feminine plurals IM and UTH, the conjunction V, and the title ELION, *Most High*, applied to the Deity, sufficiently prove the character of the language. We know from Philo Biblius (who quotes Sanchoniathon), that the Phœnicians used this term 'Ελιών, as the appellation of their gods. Concerning another word in this one line, קרת, here read Corath, a city, we may also observe, that it is closely connected with Carthage itself; as it forms one of the etymological roots of the name of that very city, originally Carthada, which Solinus and Eustathias inform us meant *the new city*, Νεάπολις; and must therefore have been קרתאחדתא, thus read Carthachedta, Καρχήδων. This root entered into the denomination of many cities in Palestine, *e. g.* Cariath arba, *four towns*; Cariath Baal, *Baalstown*; Cariath iarim, *Woodtown*; Cariath sanna, *Brambletown*; Cariath sephar, *Lettertowntown*. An etymologist may perhaps refer the Celtic appellative for a city, Caer, to the same root."

are required to express 2000 radical words, will be evidently, as far as the present question is concerned, in the same situation with two individuals having each a die with 512 faces, (the faces of both dice being distinguished by the same regular series of numbers, or other corresponding marks,) and having the trial of 2000 throws allowed them. If we adopt this illustration, the accidental coincidences of the terms which may happen to be employed by both languages to express the same object, will obviously be strictly analogous to the cases of doublets occurring in the same throw between the two dicers.

“ Now, according to Demoivre's formula, Problem 3, *Doctrine of Chances*, we may readily find in how many trials an event will probably happen, if the number of cases favourable and unfavourable to its happening in any one trial be given; for, let x be the number of trials required, a the favourable and b the unfavourable cases in any one trial, and let q be so assumed that $q : 1 :: b : a$, or $q = \frac{b}{a}$. Hence he de-

duces, by a process which it is unnecessary here to repeat, the equation, that whenever q is pretty large in respect to unity, $x = q \times \text{hyperbolic log. 2}$, or 0.693 ; therefore $x = 0.7 \times q$, nearly; and x so soon converges to the limit $0.7 \times q$, that this value of x may be assumed in all cases, be the value of q what it may. To apply this to the particular instance presented by our problem, the favourable case for a doublet being one only out of 512; here $a : b :: 1 : (511 = q)$; therefore $x = 511 \times 0.7 = 357.7$. Therefore we may expect a doublet with the two dice in about 358 throws, or a coincidence in the two languages in the same number of terms.

“ We have thus, then, ascertained in what number of terms a single coincidence may be expected; but a further process is necessary before we can infer from hence what number of coincidences may be expected in 2000 terms, or in the total number of radical words; for it appears, upon investigation, that the number of events rendered probable is far from increasing in a proportion equally rapid with the increasing number of trials, so that we should be altogether in error were we to conclude that the number of coincidences in 2000 terms would be the same multiple of one, that 2000 is of 358, the period of the arrival of the first coincidence. Demoivre, in his fourth and fifth problems, has investigated this subject, and established a formula, of which a numerical expression is given below.* Hence we learn that in our problem

* “ When q is not very small, the value of x (the number of trials in which the event may be expected,) will be

For a single event..... $0.693 \times q$.
 — double event..... $1.678 \times q$.
 — triple event..... $2.675 \times q$.
 — quadruple event..... $3.672 \times q$.
 — quintuple event..... $4.670 \times q$.
 — sextuple event..... $5.668 \times q$.

And if the number of events be pretty large in respect to unity, call it n , and then

$$x = \frac{2n-1}{2} \cdot q.$$

four coincidences may be expected in $(511 \times 3.672) \approx 1870.392$ terms, or about $4\frac{1}{2}$ in 2000.

“The probable accidental coincidences, therefore, between two languages, such as the Semitic and Indo-European mother tongues, will be less than five, if our data have been correctly assumed; and the only error to the suspicion of which they appear at all liable, is one having a tendency to give an estimate in excess, not in defect; for it may, perhaps, be said, that in taking only trilateral elementary roots into our account, we have excluded unfairly certain biliteral and quadrilateral combinations, and thus taken the number of roots too low. But in proportion as we should increase the number of these elementary literal roots, it is obvious we shall diminish that of the probable accidental coincidences. In this case, therefore, we shall have certainly understated rather than overstated the force of our argument, in favour of the original connexion of the mother tongues compared, as derived from the superiority in number of the actual coincidences to those which can appear at all probable as of accidental occurrence. No one can cast a hasty glance over the table of coincidences of the Semitic dialects with those of the Indo-European languages, without being at once struck with the evidence of such a superiority. It is quite unnecessary to insist how strong an argument is thus afforded in favour of the Scriptural hypothesis of the original unity of the human species; and this argument is the more valuable, as being purely derived from that mode of reasoning which alone can never be suspected of being in any manner biassed by prejudice,—simple mathematical investigation.”—302—305.

The second case on which a similar calculus is brought to bear, is “to determine in what proportion the improbability of accidental coincidence is increased, when we find several consecutive coincidences in corresponding series of terms, e. g. the successive persons of verbs, &c., in two languages.”—pp. 305, 306.

The third case is in like manner “to determine the probable number of accidental coincidences which may be expected in a given number of languages (say 100) in any single term.—p. 307.

And the conclusion is—

“By similar reasoning we may infer that in the whole 2000 radical terms we shall have a number of more than 19,000 coincidences between the whole 100 languages taken collectively. This will show us that little dependence can be placed on general comparisons of all the known languages considered in a mass, as an argument to support the opinion of the original unity of our species, since, thus considered, so large a number of coincidences may probably be accidental; but the true point to which we ought to direct our attention, is the comparison in detail of each definite pair. We have already seen how favourable such a comparison proves to be in the instance of the Semitic and Indo-European classes; and since these, *prima facie*, appear quite as distinct as any other two families, we have at least a favourable ground of presumption that the other languages, which at present appear widely dis-

similar, may by a similar examination be shown to have been probably originally connected. Comparative philology is, indeed, as yet too much in its infancy to allow our doing this at present to any considerable extent; but I shall conceive my time to have been very usefully spent, if I have in any degree succeeded in illustrating the path necessary to be pursued in order to bring the question to the arbitration of a precise and strict method of reasoning."—pp. 308, 309.

Now, without vouching for the accuracy of the "*preliminary data*," or inquiring to what precise extent mathematical formulæ may be applied, fairly and safely, to philological questions, we regard this postscript as the most novel and interesting part of a very valuable publication. It teaches us, by a new example, how all human knowledge may furnish its contingent into the treasury of Divine truth: how sciences, apparently the most remote from the evidences of Christianity, and sometimes, even in the hands of their professors, supposed to be hostile to its progress, may be rendered subservient to the triumph of revelation: how, in fact, the calculations of Demoivre, or La Place, may be brought to establish the universal origin of mankind from a single pair, and the primitive identity of language, amidst all the now existing diversity and confusion of tongues and dialects. Thus the subtle and delicate essence of mathematical computation is employed to illustrate the most distant and most momentous occurrences in the history of man. Thus, more and more, will even darkness itself, as Professor Sedgwick has magnificently said, "be steeped in everlasting light, the first-born of heaven;" and the whole universe will pour out its choral homage to the Almighty architect; as in that hymn of Cleanthes the Stoic, than which, as Mr. Conybeare observes, "classical antiquity has bequeathed to us no finer address to the Deity:"

"Σοὶ μὲν πᾶς ὁδε κόσμος ἐλίσσόμενος περὶ γαῖαν
Πείθεται ἢ κεν ἄγῃς, καὶ ἐκὼν ὑπὸ Σείῳ κρατεῖται.

"This circling universe, its willing way
Bends where thou biddst, and worlds thy Word obey."—p. 20.

We had desired to notice, among other things, the section which treats of "*Hermeneutics*;" and we should be extremely grieved if the course of our review should lead any persons to suppose that Mr. Conybeare's lectures consist merely or mainly of scientific and literary disquisitions concerning the outworks of religion, without entering, with a befitting seriousness and care, into the peculiar mysteries and vital doctrines of our faith, and considering Christianity, both as an authoritative code given by Divine inspiration, and yet more, as a remedial dispensation for the wants and corruptions of human nature. Such a notion of

them would be no less mistaken than injurious. But our limits are exhausted: though not our admiration of Mr. Conybeare's work. It is written closely, but clearly; with condensation, but without obscurity. It is this luminous brevity and compactness, which, as we have already hinted, has prevented us from giving a *précis* of the whole, and compelled us to content ourselves with detached quotations. These lectures, let us conclude by stating, deserve the most sedulous perusal. Full of thought themselves, they will suggest thought to the reader. They cannot be too highly recommended to the more advanced grade of Theological students: nor can they be taken in hand by the most matured scholar and divine without affording to him an ample payment of instruction, and pleasure and profit.

ART. VI.—*Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*. By Nicholas Wiseman, D.D. London: Booker. 1836.

WE are no friends to Popery, as our readers will bear us witness; yet, we confess, we were not displeased at the publication of Dr. Wiseman's Lectures. In truth, the foundation of the English Church lies very deep, while the views and principles of a number of her children are very shallow; so there is no inconsistency in welcoming a controversy which will be an advantage to them, yet no harm to her. Much as we sympathize, as we ought, with those of our own body, and strong as our party feelings necessarily are when they enter into the lists, yet we have brought ourselves to believe, that in the present case defeat and perplexity are for their good. Reverses in argument may humble and sober them, may make them see they have something to add to their present stock of theological knowledge, and teach them somewhat more clearly what it is they are defending, and on what principles the English Church stands; and on this account we can bear to contemplate what in itself will be a pain to all who are connected with them, and a triumph to the enemy. We conceive the controversy with Rome will have the effect of recalling them to those good and true views of divinity which numbers of them have nearly abandoned. Moreover (if it may be said) our very devotion to the Church herself inspires us with somewhat of a serious feeling against such of her champions as are not able to defend without degrading her;—who maintain her, as if she were a mere establishment, and as they would support the new system for administering the poor laws or the London police. Let us be candid; there is still another reason which

somewhat increases our satisfaction at Dr. Wiseman's and similar publications. The line of argument against Romanism adopted by our great divines has not been deemed good enough by many of us moderns; it has been judged severe and uncharitable to Dissenters of various denominations to walk in the steps of Hammond and Beveridge; and if some isolated individuals have ventured to do so, they have been promptly and unscrupulously ranked as confederates with the corrupt system which they professed to oppose. Well, then, let us see whether these more clear-sighted religionists (as they think themselves), these pure Protestants and rigid Scripturists, will make a better and more satisfactory fight when they come into close contact with their foe, that crafty foe which shelters its errors under the truths which such adversaries wantonly, unreluctantly surrender to it as its own. Hitherto they have either skirmished with the enemy, or have engaged at an advantage which they can never expect again. It is a very different thing to attack Romanism on ultra-Protestant principles in an open field, or to have the law and the multitude on our side. The latter has been the condition of things during the last 150 years; Protestantism was the sovereign religion of the state, and the great object of policy was to repress and keep under Romanism. The English Church has been upheld, not on its own merits, but as a useful antagonist to the church of Rome, and a substitute for it. Irreligious statesmen thought it a stop-gap, and they confronted it to the Romanists, as much as to say, "we have our Church as well as you; we can make a church for the occasion." They used it (we speak in sober sadness, and with shame) as if it were an abbot of Unreason in mock controversy with the abbot of Kennaquhair. We could enlarge upon this fact were it decorous to do so. Another principal use of the English Church in the eyes of politicians has been its suppressal of enthusiasm and extravagance in religion. And to these must be added the more obvious national blessings which it dispenses, and which are so fully understood and so eloquently stated at conservative meetings and dinners. All these circumstances have invested the cause of the English Church hitherto with a popularity external for the most part to its own principles; and Romanism has had to contend since the Revolution rather with the power of the civil sword than the arguments of divines. Arguments indeed have been used, but they have been drawn from any quarter without weighing whether they had too much or too little in them for the purpose of the English Church, rather as if to comply with a rule of the game, than as if the words used were intended to have any particular meaning. But now that the English Church has been bereft of its civil defences, it has but an alternative of defending itself, or retreating backward into the lines

of that mixed multitude of denominations, which alone the state seems to recognize and cherish. Its defenders must either reform their arguments, or modify their conclusions; must either reason as true Catholics, or profess themselves mere Latitudinarians.

And there is danger certainly, and (as some persons think) a very considerable one, of the English Church, at this era of her history, acquiescing in the latter alternative. There is certainly a strong party in the Church, who would be pleased to obliterate her distinctive marks, in order to increase her political security. We are not accusing such men of what is commonly called *worldly-mindedness*. They think the religious advantages of an establishment such, that it is *tanti* to make, what seems to them, but a little alteration in its doctrines, for the sake of preserving it. The government says to them, "*you* must reform, (to use the fashionable word), or others will reform for you;" so to prevent evil men from altering the *political relations* of the Church, they consent to alter its *principles*. And certainly our Church has before now been betrayed in this manner by those who are her consecrated defenders; which throws an additional shade over the prospect of the future. Yet, whatever be her present weakness, whatever treachery there be within the camp, we conceive that her controversy with Rome will advantage her rather than otherwise. Many men, doubtless, will run from fear of Popery into the opposite extreme, and thus fulfil Horace's remark. Such of the laity, especially, as lightly employ themselves in the controversy, being bound by no obligations to the principles of our Church, will, it is to be feared, take refuge in ultra-Protestantism. With the Clergy we should hope it would be otherwise; they are tutored in the words and services of the Church, even when they do not understand her spirit; and the collision with Rome must in consequence rather bring them nearer to Rome (in those points in which Rome has preserved neglected truths) than drive them further off. An untaught layman, for instance, who never read the Ordination Service, may scoff at the doctrine of the ministerial commission when brought forward by the Romanist; but one who has had the awful words pronounced over him, in which it is conveyed in our ritual, cannot deny the doctrine, and at the very utmost will but keep silence—cannot go further than doubt—when it is urged upon him. He may have forgotten, he cannot oppose it. The clergy, in fact, are bound to true Catholicism by firm, though (of late) neglected ties; and the controversy with Rome will but remind them of them, and lead them to use them. At the same time that this will lead to a still wider separation between the views of Churchmen and those of our civil governors it is impossible to deny.

Nor do we think that the controversy will tend, on the other hand, to any dangerous spread of Romanism. That it will spread is likely enough, though we have no proof of its success among us hitherto; but, if it spreads, it will spread among Dissenters and irregulars. Men who are one day of one religion and another of another, will at length become victims of Rome,—they are its fit prey. Far from lamenting them, we shall consider them better off than when they were carried about by every wind of doctrine. The tyranny will be profitable, though it be a “house of bondage” and an iron yoke; and for corruption of faith, they have not so much purity to boast of at present, that we should think their case very pitiable. It is better to be fixed and quiet than ever to be restless and changing; better to be superstitious than profane; better to have the ordinances of grace than to be without them; and Romanism will benefit in these three ways the mere Protestants whom it converts.

For all these reasons we hear with great equanimity the rumours of the impression which Dr. Wiseman's lectures have made upon the mixed multitude of London. Romanism has great truths in it, which we of this day have almost forgotten; and its preachers will recall numbers of Churchmen and Dissenters to an acknowledgment of them: Dissenters who never had them will embrace them in their Roman form; Churchmen who have received, but forgotten them, will discern them, and use them in the Church. We cannot hope for unity and peace in our time. We have but a choice of evils, and perhaps pure Anglicanism and pure Romanism would not be worse than the present unmeaning conglomeration of sects and parties, which tends to the ruin of all that is devotional, generous and humble-minded.

How far we have degenerated from the characteristic principle of our Reformation in the sixteenth century, appears in nothing more than in this; that, while to say a word in favour of any part of the Roman system is reckoned a symptom of Popery, yet the very persons who so consider it will have no scruple whatever, not only in recommending, and giving away the works of Dissenters, but in co-operating with them. Multitudes who consider themselves sound members of our Church, and are so, as far as good feeling and religious sentiment go, would feel no remorse at giving away Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*, or Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, while they would be surprised to hear any thing good said of Dr. Wiseman's lectures, as tending, not indeed to the end which he anticipates, but to the revival of certain truths which have been for some years forgotten. They would consider this as all one with recommending Popery; but if so, how is our Church's doctrine a *via media*? quite as fairly,

to say the least, might *they* be called Dissenters for circulating the popular works above mentioned.

With this explanation of the feelings with which we view Dr. Wiseman's appearance in the metropolis, we turn to his published lectures. The doctrines he discusses are far too ample for the limits of a review; it may be best therefore to confine ourselves to the subject most elaborately treated in them, and indeed the most important, viz. what is commonly called the Rule of Faith. He undertakes, of course, to justify his own Church's doctrine concerning it, and his arguments are of the following kind:—Romanists, or, as he calls them, Catholics, consider there is a living infallible authority in matters of faith. Protestants, among whom he includes the English Church, consider the Bible the sole authority; the latter principle is, in every way of viewing it, ill suited, or rather inadequate for the purposes of a rule, the former is simple, intelligible and applicable on all occasions; there is, then, a very great antecedent probability in favour of the Roman and against the English rule. Next he professes to prove the Roman rule from Scripture; and then to confirm its divine original from its fruits. Now this statement affords abundant matter for exception.

Dr. Wiseman would make it appear as if there were no medium between the two alternatives above stated; between an infallible living guide, and no guide besides Scripture itself. Now this is far from being the case; for at least English theology does admit a guide, though not an infallible one, but subordinate to Scripture. It considers that Scripture is not an easy book, and, as so considering, believes also that Almighty God has been pleased to provide a guide. The 20th Article expressly declares, that the Church "hath authority in controversies of faith." There is, then, at least there is professed, whether or not it can be maintained, a middle view between the two extremes with which he opens his lectures.

In his second lecture Dr. Wiseman acknowledges this; but then he attempts to show that the article above quoted is unmeaning, and leaves matters as it finds them. He frankly acknowledges in the most candid way, that, as far as the wording of the Articles go, there is no countenance therein given in matters of faith to the exercise of private judgment on the text of Scripture. He says, quoting the 6th Article, "in this passage there is not one word about the individual right of any one to judge for himself; it is only that no one is to be *charged* with the belief of any doctrine, no one can be *required* to give his adhesion to any article which is not contained in the word of God."—p. 28. He goes on to state most clearly and truly what the drift of the Article really is; "the rule, he says, "is more to prevent some one,

not named, from exacting belief beyond a certain point; it is a limitation of the power to *require* submission to the teaching of some authority. That this authority is the Church there can be no doubt;" and then he quotes the 20th Article; "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," provided it ordains nothing "contrary to God's word written," or so expounds "any passage of Scripture as to be repugnant to another."

Nothing can be clearer; the English doctrine does not encourage private judgment in matters of (necessary) faith, but maintains the Church's authority. But Dr. Wiseman sees so much perplexity in this view, that after this clear exposition of it, he abandons it, from inability to apply or use it. His first objection is, that there is a practical absurdity in saying that the Church has authority and yet must go by Scripture; for, he argues, who is to *judge* whether it goes by Scripture or not? Either then, he says, the article is nugatory or it throws us upon some higher tribunal; as for instance, private judgment. No surely; the article need not be nugatory, though we do not have recourse to any further tribunal. *How* shall we know, does Dr. Wiseman say, whether the Church goes by Scripture or not in her decisions? Why, suppose she herself *confesses* she does not, and maintains she *need* not. Dr. Wiseman says the article aims at "some one not named;" perhaps he is aware of "some one not named," who, claiming to be the Church Catholic, also claims to decide by tradition, without Scripture, in matters of faith. What need of a further tribunal when we have "confitentem reum?" Will he reply that the Roman Church does *not* grant that it can decree things *contrary* to Scripture? true, but it claims to decree points of faith *beyond* Scripture. And this is the authority which we deny it. We do not deny that many things may be true which are not in Scripture; but we deny such are points of what is emphatically called the *faith*, i. e. points necessary to be believed in order to salvation; and whether or not it be easy to determine what doctrines *are* in Scripture and what not, at least we may safely take the Roman Church's own word, when she *confesses* she is determining from Tradition, not from Scripture. For instance, the Council of Trent makes it necessary to salvation to believe that it is "good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints," and this on the ground of its being "*juxta Catholicæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ usum à primævis Christianæ religionis temporibus receptum, sanctorumque Patrum consentionem, et sacrorum Conciliorum decreta;*" not a word being said of Scripture sanction. This is the principle which we altogether disavow; we allow that the Church may pronounce doctrines as *true* which are not in Scripture, so that they are not against it, but we do not think that she may declare points to be necessary to be believed in order to salvation, and may act accord-

ingly, unless she professes to derive them from Scripture. We consider that her decision in such extra-scriptural matters is not secure from error; is entitled indeed to veneration, but has not, strictly speaking, *authority*, and therefore may not rightly be *enforced*. This distinction is made at the end of the twentieth article. "As it (the Church) ought not to *decree* any thing *against* the same, so *besides* the same ought it not to *enforce* any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation." The Church must not enforce beyond Scripture; it may decree, i. e. pronounce, beyond it, but not against it.

Here, then, we have a most consistent meaning given to these articles, a plain and obvious drift. They are directed against the Church of Rome, which does professedly violate the principle therein propounded. But Dr. Wiseman will ask, how this helps us in a case where the Church *does* profess to be guided by Scripture. "It so *happens*," he may say, "that the Roman Church affords a case when the rule has a meaning; but this is but a fortunate exception. May the Church always be judge in its own cause; and, as her witness is to be taken when she owns she goes beyond Scripture, is it also decisive when she professes to deduce from it? In short, is this article intended to explain to us a positive theory, or is it merely directed against the Romanists? It restrains the authority of the Church, does it define it?"

Now this very article does not supply the full limitations which Anglicans put upon the Church's authority; we find another limitation mentioned elsewhere. In the Canon of the very Convocation, (1571), which confirmed the Articles, it is declared that nothing should be preached to be religiously held by the people, but what is agreeable to Scripture doctrine, and *gathered thence by the "Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops."* This then is a second restriction, and, acting under these two, we may safely say that the Church, i. e. the Church Catholic, has absolute authority in matters of necessary or saving faith, and supersedes so far private judgment upon the text of Scripture—that, as ruling herself by Scripture and antiquity, she may securely and implicitly be trusted in all matters of necessary doctrine; nay further, we may even grant (to imitate Dr. Wiseman's mode of varying his proposition, p. 30,) she literally *cannot*, that is, she has a promise that she never will, enforce any thing as a point of necessary faith which is not at once Scriptural and primitive, and that so she is a sure authority. As it is her *duty* ever diligently to study Scripture and antiquity, so it is her *privilege* to be assured she shall be kept ever from departing from these two joint guides. And this is one token that the Church of Rome is not the Church Catholic, but a particular Church; because she has avowed and used a different rule.

The doctrine we have elicited as the Anglican, in the course of these remarks, viz. that the Church Catholic is indefectible in matters of necessary and saving truth, will, perhaps, startle some persons till they are assured that it is taught by our principal divines; some of whom express it in the very words which we have just used. Let the force of our words be clearly understood. By matters of *faith* are meant, not all doctrines which may be gathered from the Bible, but fundamental and necessary to be believed; nor again, new doctrines, but the old and original articles; for by the hypothesis the Church ever will be guided by antiquity. Again, we speak of the Church Catholic; not of portions of the Church; of these, another of our Articles declares expressly, that "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred . . . in matters of faith." (Art. 19.) We mean that the whole Church, all over the world, will never agree together in teaching and enforcing what is not true. With these explanations, is not the doctrine as true in fact, as it is natural and probable in itself? There is surely no harshness, even at first sight, in supposing that so far Divine Providence may watch over his own work; and, in fact, the supposition is, and ever has been, much more than fulfilled. All over Christendom that faith which St. Athanasius, for instance, held, is still held as the Christian faith. *All* its branches, one and all, believe in the Trinity and Incarnation, which have ever been considered the fundamental or essential doctrines of the Gospel.

But the reader shall have the very words of some of our standard Divines. "In this troublesome and quarrelsome age," says Laud, "I am most unwilling to meddle with the erring of the Church in general. The Church of England is content to pass that over; and, though she tells us that the Church of Rome hath erred even in matters of faith, yet of the erring of the Church in general she is modestly silent. But since A.C." Fisher's partisan, "will needs have it, that the whole Church did never generally err in *any one* point of faith," (he uses faith here not for *necessary* doctrine only,) "he should do well to distinguish, before he be so peremptory. For if he mean, no more than that the whole universal Church of Christ cannot universally err in any one point of faith, *simply necessary to all men's salvation*, he fights with no adversary, that I know, but his own fiction, for the most learned Protestants grant it".—*Conference with Fisher*, p. 160; *vide*, also, p. 139, 240. Bramhall says, "We do readily acknowledge that the true Catholic Church is so far infallible, as is necessary to the salvation of Christians; that is the end of the Church."—p. 282. Again, "We believe the Holy Ghost doth lead the Catholic or Universal Church into all truths, which are simply necessary to

salvation, and preserves it from all such damnable errors, as are destructive to saving faith; so that the gates of hell never prevail against it. But we believe also that it is the property of the Church triumphant, to be without all spots and wrinkles; particular Churches are of another matter, they have no such privilege, no not Rome itself."—p. 1018, *vide* also p. 30. Stillingfleet says, in his *Grounds of the Protestant Religion*, "The most that we assert is, that there is and shall always be a Church, for that is all that is meant by a Church being infallible in fundamentals; now for this we have the greatest assurance possible, that there shall be, from the promises of Christ, and that there is, from the certainty we have of the faith and baptism of Christians."—*Grounds*, p. 518. Again, "This is all which is meant by saying, that the present Church is infallible in fundamentals; viz. that there shall always be a Church; for that which makes them a Church, is the belief of fundamentals."—p. 233. In like manner Hammond, treating of Œcumenical Councils, makes a still larger admission. "Though I make it no matter of faith," he says, "because delivered neither by Scripture nor Apostolic Tradition, yet I shall number it among the *piè credibilia*, that no general council, *truly such*," (i. e. not the professed and pretended general councils of which our 21st Article speaks *historically*,) "first, duly assembled; second, freely celebrated; and third, universally received, either hath erred, or ever shall err, in matters of faith."—*Of Heresy*, § 9.

Ussher's authority is still more valuable, on account of his being supposed to hold some private uncatholic opinions. "In all places of the world," he says, in his Sermon on Eph. iv. 13, "where the ancient foundations were retained, and these common principles of faith, upon the profession whereof men have ever been wont to be admitted by baptism into the Church of Christ, there we doubt not but our Lord had his subjects, and we our fellow-servants; for we bring in no new faith, nor no new Church. That which in the time of the Ancient Fathers was accounted to be 'truly and properly Catholic,' namely, 'that which was believed *every where, always, and by all*,' that in *the succeeding ages hath evermore been preserved*, and is at this day entirely professed in our Church. And it is well observed by a learned man, (Serranus, *Appar. ad Fid. Cath.*) who hath written a full discourse of this argument, that 'whatsoever the father of lies either hath attempted, or shall attempt, yet neither hath he hitherto effected, nor shall ever bring it to pass hereafter, that this Catholic doctrine, ratified by the common consent of Christians always and every where, should be abolished, but that in the thickest mist rather of the most perplexed troubles, it still obtained victory, both in the

minds and in the open confessions of all Christians, no way overturned in the foundation thereof; and that in this verity, that one Church of Christ was preserved in the midst of the tempests of the most cruel winter, or in the thickest darkness of her wanings.* Thus, if at this day, we should take a survey of the several professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world, as of the religion of the Roman and the Reformed Churches in our quarters, of the Egyptians and Ethiopians in the South, of the Grecians and other Christians in the Eastern parts, and should put by the points wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the articles wherein they all did generally agree; we should find, that *in those propositions which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much truth is contained, as, being joined with holy obedience, may be sufficient to bring a man unto everlasting salvation.* Neither have we cause to doubt, but that, 'as many as do walk according to this rule,' neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by superinducing any 'damnable heresies' thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their 'holy faith' with a lewd and wicked conversation, 'peace shall be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.' Now these common principles of the Christian faith, which we call *κοινώματα*, or things 'generally believed' of all, as they have *universality*, and *antiquity*, and *consent* concurring with them, which, by Vincentius's rule, are the special character of that which is truly and properly Catholic, so for their duration we are sure *that they have still held out*, and been kept as the *seminary* of the Catholic Church in the darkest and difficultest times that ever have been; when, if the Lord of Hosts had not in his mercy reserved the seed unto us, we should long since have been as Sodom, &c."

Considering the importance of the point in question, the little acquaintance of most persons with our standard divines, and the consequent confusion in the popular mind between true Catholicism and Popery, we have not scrupled to make extracts instead of setting down references at the foot of the page. The above passages, to which many more might be added, are *facts* against Dr. Wiseman,—facts in evidence that it is possible to protest against Romanism without holding in consequence that Christian doctrine is of a variable or private nature, left for individuals to deduce from Scripture, by their own ability, apart from the testimony of the general Church. They speak of the Church as always holding indefectibly, or knowing infallibly, those doctrines which are the fundamentals of faith; from which position its absolute authority in respect to them necessarily follows. What the

Church Catholic now is, whether the Church in communion with Rome, or the mere multitude of professing Christians poured over all countries, or the Church Episcopal throughout the world, or the established Churches in various countries, this is a question most incumbent on us to answer, but not entering into the present discussion; which is merely on this one point—do our Articles mean what they say, and what Dr. Wiseman allows they say, when they give the Church “authority in controversies of faith,” whatever “the Church” is? On the other hand, what fundamentals are, may, as Ussher intimates, be exactly ascertained by referring to those times when there is no doubt either what and where the Church was, or what her faith was. What were considered the necessary articles of faith in the early Church is a matter of history; *these* are they which we Anglicans consider the Church indefectibly to preserve even to the end; these accordingly are the points in which she has “authority,” not as a judge or arbiter, so much as a witness. The characteristic difference then, between the English and Roman doctrine in the point under consideration is this—that Romanists conceive that the Church may create articles of *necessary* belief; that what was not necessary to be believed in order to salvation before her decision, becomes so afterwards; whereas we consider that the one saving faith has, from the first, been ever promulgated; that the Church does not, by her decision, make any part of it saving, but merely declares it: in other words, they consider the Church an infallible arbiter *pro re natâ*; we, a faithful and indefectible guardian of what was, in the first instance, *given* as saving. Both parties consider “the faith” to be *necessary to salvation*; but we say the faith is prior to the Church; they, the Church is prior to the faith.

Now, before continuing our examination of Dr. Wiseman’s argument in order, let us pass on for an instant to his fourth lecture, in which he adduces some of the texts on which his Church builds her claim to absolute infallibility. He quotes the 54th and 59th chapters of the prophet Isaiah, which address the Church as follows:

“Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes. . . . with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee. . . . My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee. . . . All thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children. . . . No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. . . . This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of

the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."

These are certainly most remarkable and impressive promises, and grow upon the mind the more we meditate upon them. The first question is, "Of whom speaketh the Prophet this?" And we may, doubtless, as confidently answer, "Of the Church which the apostles founded," as St. Philip answered the Ethiopian's question, by "preaching unto him Jesus." But is not the prophecy fulfilled abundantly, if it so happen, as we maintain, that the Church then founded, whatever have been its errors and sins, has, up to this day, kept that deposit of necessary faith which was pronounced to be necessary at the time it was set up? That it is not fulfilled in its highest conceivable sense, even Dr. Wiseman must confess. He must confess that heresy and schism have been infringements of the letter of the prophecy; being spots and wrinkles in the Church during the time of their growth, and an enfeebling of her when they were cast out. As, then, he considers it as fulfilled by there being *one* place (Rome) where perfect purity of *all* doctrine ever has been, so we surely may account its fulfilment to lie in there having been ever in *all* places, perfect maintenance of *fundamental* doctrine. And, while we do dispute his fulfilment, he cannot dispute ours; for he cannot deny, that in matters of faith the whole Church descended from the Apostles now holds fundamental what the early ages held to be so: he will only claim to his Church, which he identifies with the true one, the power of *adding* to the fundamentals. The same remarks apply to the other passages quoted by Dr. Wiseman, such as Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

But to return. If we have correctly drawn out the Anglican doctrine, it is as distinct from Romanism as from common Protestantism. The Romanist gives to the existing *Church* the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith; the Ultra-Protestant to the *individual*; and the Anglican to *antiquity*, giving authority to the Church, as being the witness and voice, or rather the very presence of Antiquity among us. And here we arrive at another misunderstanding of our doctrine, into which it has already been implied Dr. Wiseman has fallen. We are indeed surprised that so well-read a man should not have recollected more of the divinity of our standard authors, than to assert that the fundamental principle of Protestantism, as *recognized in the English Church* (for he speaks of us Anglicans all along) is, that "the Word of God alone is the true standard and rule of faith." Now let us be understood here; we know full well that this is a popular mode of speaking at this day; we know well it is an opinion *in* our Church; but it is by no means an opinion universally

received, much less a principle. And Dr. Wiseman as a *well read* divine ought to recollect this. Let it be observed, that he interprets the above principle to mean that "each one must have studied the Word of God, and *must have drawn from it* the faith which he holds."—pp. 8, 9. Now can this be truly, nay fairly said, we will not say, by a well read divine, but by an intelligent observer of the English Church for the last twenty years? Is Dr. Wiseman a stranger to the continual and violent charges brought against far the larger portion of the Church, of its making the Prayer Book "a safeguard" to the Bible? Has not the body of the Church opposed the Bible Society on this ground? Nay, to go higher, do we not read in our service, the Athanasian Creed, which, whether it allows private judgment or not, clearly propounds that unless private judgment terminate in the reception of certain most definite statements of doctrine, it incurs the Church's direct and absolute anathema? Considering the assaults conducted by individuals on this Creed; considering the continued struggle against what is sometimes called the High Church party, for a series of years past, on the ground of its enforcing one certain interpretation of the Word of God, under what impression, or in what state of mind, does Dr. Wiseman take for granted that the English Church consigns the Bible to each individual, and bids him draw his faith thence; confessing, as he does, at the same time, there is nothing in the Articles to countenance such a proceeding? That many individuals in the Church do so, is true; but with what show of reason does he fasten it on us as the "essential ground?"

But he will appeal, perhaps, in his defence, to a phrase in use among us, viz. that the Bible is "the rule of faith;" a phrase most correct in one sense, most untrue in another. By "Rule" may be meant either *Standard*, as Dr. Wiseman correctly explains it in one place, or *Guide*. Now the Bible is *not* our only guide or teacher; it is our only standard, test, or depository of faith. Now the Romanists deny that the Bible is a rule *in either sense*; when the Anglicans say that the Bible *is* the rule of faith, they say it in opposition to the Romanists; and since the Romanists deny it in any sense, they do not think it worth while to stop and define, and make irrelevant distinctions. But when the Ultra-Protestant comes upon them, and catches up and perverts their words, and says, "You admit the Bible is a rule of faith; therefore it is our sole *guide*," we answer, as our Church has ever answered, "No; it is our sole document, basis of proof, record, standard of appeal, touchstone of the faith, not the sole guide, for the Church is a guide, having 'authority in matters of faith.'" Dr. Wiseman has looked at the English Church not even superficially.

For ourselves, we confess, we are willing to dispense with the phrase "Rule of Faith," as applied to Scripture, on the ground of its being ambiguous; and, again, because it is then used in a novel sense, for the ancient Church made the Apostolic Tradition, as summed up in the Creed, and not the Bible, the "*Regula Fidei*" or Rule. Moreover, its use as a technical phrase seems to be of late introduction in the Church, that is, since the days of King William the Third. Our great divines use it without any fixed sense, sometimes for Scripture, sometimes for the whole and perfectly adjusted Christian doctrine, sometimes for the Creed; and, at the risk of being tedious, we will prove this by quotations, that the point may be put beyond dispute.

Ussher, after St. Austin, identifies it with the Creed;—when speaking of the Article of our Lord's descent to Hell, he says,

"It having here likewise been further manifested, what different opinions have been entertained by the ancient Doctors of the Church, concerning the determinate place wherein our Saviour's soul did remain during the time of the separation of it from the body, I leave it to be considered by the learned, whether any such controverted matter may fitly be brought in to *expound the Rule of Faith*, which, being common both to the great and the small ones of the Church, must contain such varieties only as are generally agreed upon by the common consent of all true Christians."—*Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 362.

Taylor speaks to the same purpose: "Let us see a little further, with what constancy, that and the following ages of the Church did adhere to the Apostles' Creed, as the sufficient and perfect *Rule of Faith*."—*Dissuasive*, part 2, i, 4, p. 470. Elsewhere, he calls Scripture the Rule; "That the Scripture is a full and sufficient *Rule* to Christians in faith and manners, a full and perfect declaration of the will of God, is therefore certain, because we have no other."—*Ibid.* part 2, i, 2, p. 384. Elsewhere, Scripture and the Creed; "He hath by His wise providence preserved the plain places of Scripture and the Apostles' Creed, in all Churches to be the *Rule* and Measure of Faith, by which all Churches are saved,"—*Ibid.* part 2, i, 1, p. 346. Elsewhere he identifies it with Scripture, the Creeds, and the first four Councils: "We also" [after Scripture] "do believe the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, with the additions of Constantino-ple, and that which is commonly called the symbol of St. Athanasius; and the four first General Councils are so entirely admitted by us, that they, together with the plain words of Scripture, are made the *Rule* and measure of judging heresies among us."—*Ibid.* part 1, i, 1, p. 131.

Laud calls the Creed, or rather the Creed with Scripture, the Rule. "Since the Fathers make the Creed the *Rule of Faith*,

since the agreeing sense of Scripture with those Articles are the *Two Regular Precepts*, by which a Divine is governed about his faith," &c.—*Conference with Fisher*, p. 42.

Bramhall also: "The Scriptures and the Creed are not two different Rules of Faith, but *one and the same Rule, dilated in Scripture, contracted in the Creed.*"—*Works*, p. 402. Stillingfleet says the same.—(*Grounds*, i. 4, 3.) As does Thorndike.—(*De Rat. fin. Controv.* p. 144, &c.) Elsewhere, Stillingfleet calls Scripture the Rule, (*ibid.* i. 6, 2,) as does Jackson (vol. i. p. 226.) But the most complete and decisive statement on the subject, is contained in Field's work on the Church; from which we are tempted to make a long extract.

"It remained to show," he says, "what is the Rule of that judgment, whereby the Church discerneth between truth and falsehood, the faith and heresy, and to whom it properly pertaineth to interpret those things which touching this Rule are doubtful, . . . The Rule of our Faith in general, whereby we know it to be true, is the infinite excellency of God. . . . It being pre-supposed in the generality that the doctrine of the Christian faith is of God, and containeth nothing but heavenly truth, in the next place, we are to inquire by what Rule we are to judge of particular things contained within the compass of it.

"This Rule is, 1. The summary comprehension of such principal Articles of this divine knowledge, as are the principles whence all other things are concluded and inferred. These are contained in the *Creed of the Apostles*.

"2. All such things as every Christian is bound expressly to believe, by the light and direction whereof he judgeth of other things, which are not absolutely necessary so particularly to be known. These are rightly said to be the Rule of our Faith, because the principles of every science are the Rule whereby we judge of the truth of all things, as being better and more generally known, than any other thing, and the cause of knowing them.

"3. The Analogy, due proportion, and correspondence, that one thing in this divine knowledge hath with another, so that men cannot err in one of them without erring in another; nor rightly understand one, but they must likewise rightly conceive the rest.

"4. Whatsoever *Books* were delivered unto us, as written by them, to whom the first and immediate revelation of the divine truth was made.

"5. Whatsoever hath been delivered by all the saints with one consent, which have left their judgment and opinion in writing.

"6. Whatsoever the most famous have constantly and uniformly delivered, as a matter of faith, no more contradicting, though many other ecclesiastical writers be silent, and say nothing of it.

"7. That which the most, and most famous in every age, constantly delivered as matter of faith, and as received of them that went before them, in such sort that the contradictors and gainsayers were in their beginnings noted for singularity, novelty, and division, and afterwards

in process of time, if they persisted in such contradiction, charged with heresy.

“ These three latter Rules of our faith we admit, not because they are equal with the former, and originally in themselves contain the direction of our faith, but because nothing can be delivered, with such and so full consent of the people of God, as in them is expressed, but it must need be from those first authors and founders of our Christian profession. The Romanists add unto these, the decrees of Councils and determinations of Popes, making these also to be the Rules of Faith; but because we have no proof of *their* infallibility, we number them not with the rest.

“ Thus we see, how many things in several degrees and sorts are said to be Rules of our Faith. The infinite excellency of God, as that whereby the truth of the heavenly doctrine is proved. The Articles of Faith, and other verities ever expressly known in the Church, as the first principles, are the Canon by which we judge of conclusions from thence inferred. The Scripture, as containing in it all that doctrine of faith, which Christ the Son of God delivered. The uniform practice and consenting judgment of them that went before us, as a certain and undoubted explication of the things contained in the Scripture. . . . So then *we do not make Scripture the Rule of our faith, but that other things in their kind are rules likewise; in such sort that it is not safe, without respect had unto them, to judge things by the Scripture alone.*” &c.—iv. 14, pp. 364, 365.

These extracts show not only what the Anglican doctrine is, but, in particular, that the phrase “ Rule of Faith” is no symbol with us, appropriated to some one sense; certainly not, as a definition or attribute of Holy Scripture. And it is important to insist upon this, from the very great misconceptions to which the phrase gives rise. Perhaps its use had better be avoided altogether. In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith.

Returning to Dr. Wiseman, we must express our regret, that he should, in a popular lecture delivered to numbers who would have no means of being set right, display so very little knowledge of our real principles. It is no vindication of such neglect, that some Protestant preachers do the same; because he himself complains of them; and implies he is going to set them an example, and because his reputation for learning loads him with an additional responsibility. When our use of the Athanasian Creed implies that we do not think a man may choose his own doctrine from Scripture at his pleasure,—when our Articles expressly declare that the Church has authority in faith, when our great Doctors, in the clearest and strongest terms refer to the Ancient Church as an unerring guide in necessary matters, and when our existing government has for the last 20 or 30 years

incurred an especial weight of odium for resisting the alleged right of private interpretation, it is really a little hard that we should be gravely accused of teaching that "each one must have drawn from the word of God the faith which he holds." And what makes Dr. Wiseman's conduct still less comprehensible, is that he does refer to the Articles, does acknowledge the plain sense of them as investing the Church with authority, and then, from a notion of the "complexity and confusion" (p. 29) of the view resulting, takes the Rule "on the terms *on which it is commonly understood*, namely, that it is the prerogative, the unalienable privilege of every Christian, to establish for himself the truth of his doctrines from that Book which God has revealed to man." p. 31. Now really, unless it were a serious subject, one could not help smiling at so very simple a sleight of hand, as this sentence exhibits. Dr. Wiseman states the Ultra-Protestant doctrine about the "Rule of Faith." He says, "let us look into the 39 Articles for it." He finds there neither the *name* nor the *thing*. Then he says, "this is so obscure, I despair making anything of it; *therefore* let us take the popular Ultra-Protestant sense of the doctrine." Well and good; let him do so, if he will, *provided* he no longer includes the English Church, as a Church, in his subsequent discussions. The Article is not a dead letter to us, though it be to him; we see in it, what he himself allows, a something discriminating us off from the mass of Protestants. Yet he no-where says this; he no-where gives his reader any caution that he is forthwith not speaking of the English Church; no one would suppose, from any thing he goes on to say, that the Church existing in this country, the State Religion, the religion of the mass of the population, was really clear of a tenet which he is imputing to this whole country. Let him but except the English Church, and he may, for us, declaim against Protestantism as he will.

But Dr. Wiseman will say in his defence, that he has appealed to standard writers of our Church, particularly to Bishop Beveridge, in proof of our holding the Ultra-Protestant view. Now this circumstance, it is much to be feared, increases our reasons for dissatisfaction with him. He says our Articles are perplexed; under such circumstances, the plain way certainly would be to go to our principal writers for their explanation. Does he do so? No. He has indeed "carefully perused" Mr. Hartwell's Horne's chapter on the subject of the Rule of Faith; but we hear not a word of the mighty dead. But surely Beveridge is a standard writer? he is so, but we ask a little patient attention: In the first place, Dr. Wiseman acknowledges that Bishop Beveridge speaks a language *contrary* to the Article; how then

is it fair to take him as a guide to explain its consistency and applicability? But in truth he does not in any sense refer to him as a commentator on the Article, but as a substitute for the Article, as the patron of an opposite view; he does not in any degree attempt to ascertain the drift and scope of the Article; but he puts it aside. Now there is much complaint, on the part of Roman writers, of our injustice in interpreting the Tridentine Decrees by the sentiments of Roman divines. When we have done so, it has been promptly replied, that the doctrines adduced were but the opinions of individuals, opinions of the schools, and the like. Yet Protestants who have so acted (and most justifiably, as we would maintain, but that is another matter) have at least not referred to Roman divines who *opposed* the Decrees of Trent; but Dr. Wiseman, not content with going to private doctors, and in so doing, taking the very course which his friends do to this day condemn in us, selects a passage from one of our divines which actually runs counter to the authorized decision of our church. Such is his conduct towards the Church itself; towards the learned and pious Beveridge, who is truly in every sense of the word, one of the Lights of our Church, his conduct is not less inconsiderate. Suffice it to say, that the passage he quotes from Beveridge, in illustration of the Ultra-Protestant theory, does not even tend to prove that the writer thought he was bound to gather his *creed* from Scripture for himself, and even if it did, it is found in a volume, most interesting indeed and deservedly popular, but which, being written for the private purpose of settling his own principles and conduct when he was but 23 years old, and published not till after his death, can in no sense be taken as an authority in a controversial subject.

That Bishop Beveridge in his riper years, and his own publications, gave no countenance to private judgment when directed against the testimony of the Church Catholic, is abundantly manifest to those who are ever so little acquainted with him. But since persons often will not believe, unless they see, we refer Dr. Wiseman, as one out of many places which are in point, to his 6th sermon, which runs as follows:—

“ The Eternal Son of God, having with His own blood purchased to Himself an Universal Church, we cannot doubt but that He takes due care of it, that, according to his promise, ‘ the gates of hell shall never prevail against it.’ For which end, He, the head of this mystical body, doth not only defend and protect it by His Almighty power, but He so acts, guides, directs, and governs it by His Holy Spirit, that though errors and heresies may sometimes disease and trouble some parts of it, yet they can never infect the whole; but that is still kept sound and entire, notwithstanding all the power and malice of men or

devils against it. So that, if we consider the Universal Church or congregation of faithful men," [vide Article 19,] "as in all ages dispersed over the whole world, we may easily conclude, that the greatest part, from which the whole must be denominated, was always in the right; which the Ancient Fathers were so fully persuaded of, that, although the word *καθολικος* properly signifies universal, yet they commonly used it in the same sense as we do the word *orthodox*, as opposed to an heretic, calling an orthodox man a Catholic, that is, a son of the Catholic Church; as taking it for granted, that they, and only they, which constantly adhere to the doctrine of the Catholic or Universal Church, are truly orthodox; which they could not do, unless they had believed the Catholic Church to be so. And, besides that, it is part of our very Creed, that the Catholic Church is holy; which she could not be, except free from heresy, as directly opposed to true holiness. *He therefore that would be sure not to fall into damnable errors, must be sure also to continue firm and stedfast to the doctrine of the Universal Church, as being grounded upon the Scriptures rightly understood; for so every thing is, that she hath taught us. For the Catholic Church never undertook, as the Romish hath done, to coin any new doctrines of her own head: no, she always took the Scriptures for the only standard of truth, and hath accordingly delivered her sense of them in such words as she judged to agree exactly with those which are there used.*"

And presently, he continues,

"Be sure, no sober man but must acknowledge, it is more possible for himself, yea, and for any particular Church to err, than it is for the Universal Church to do so; and, therefore, it must be the safest way to use Scripture words in such a sense as the Universal Church hath always put upon them, &c."

Certainly Beveridge does give the Church "authority in controversies of faith," as fully as Laud or Hammond.

Even this is not the limit of Dr. Wiseman's misconception. He is acquainted with Leslie's works, and speaks of him as "an eminent divine of the Protestant [*i. e.* English] Church, and one who has written the most strongly, perhaps, in favour of its grounds of faith," p. 298. He says this in the recapitulation of his argument, showing that in his discussions upon the Rule of Faith, he has all along had the English Church in view, as his principal antagonist. Indeed in this passage he speaks of the "respective opinions of the two Churches," and quotes Leslie in confirmation of his own description of the nature of the controversy existing between them. He quotes Leslie, as observing that "the whole of modern religion may be said to differ essentially on *this one point*, what is the ground-work whereon faith is to be built." It is evident then, that Dr. Wiseman believes that Leslie, not being a Romanist, took that Ultra-Protestant alternative which he himself has been employed in combating. But after all such is not Leslie's view; on the contrary, the following

passage is enough to show that he agrees with Bramhall, Field, Hammond, and the rest above quoted.

"There is a Tradition," he says in his *Case between the Churches of Rome and England*, "which (for the evidence of it) we are willing to admit; that is, according to the Rule of Vincentius Lirinensis 'Quod semper, quod ubique, et ab omnibus.' . . . And we are willing to join issue with you upon this Tradition as to Purgatory. This is *universal* Tradition; and you would not desire we should be concluded by any particular Tradition of this or that Church or place; for you know there are many deceits in such."—Vol. iii. p. 156.

We have not pursued Dr. Wiseman's misconception about the English Church to its end. As if he felt it a strong measure to reject our authorized Article, and to adopt instead of the *consensus doctorum*, the unpublished opinion of a young man of twenty-three, just entering into orders, he brings, *ex abundanti cautela*, two additional testimonies, to wit, a couple of Dissenters, "the Rev. Jeremiah Jones, a celebrated nonconformist divine, at the end of the last century," (p. 33); and "another and still more celebrated divine of nearly the same period, the celebrated Richard Baxter." (p. 35.) In explanation, as it would seem, of this extraordinary selection, he adds, that the works of the former were "published at Oxford in 1827;" and that "the last of these divines was"—what we did not know before—"one of the most zealous upholders of the Established Church." *Valeant quantum*. It is a second, perhaps a heavier injustice, to Bishop Beveridge to put him in such company.

One more observation must be made on Dr. Wiseman's argument. Besides the above-mentioned authors, he does quote one other writer, of the English Church—"a very modern one, and which in the Church of England should be considered essentially orthodox." Then follow some quotations from Mr. Newman's work on the Arians, which he represents as spoken well of "by many who are considered very accurate in their acquaintance with the doctrines of that Church."* He quotes from this work some passages which speak of the authority existing, and acknowledged as existing, in the Primitive Church Catholic, considered as the teacher of Gospel truth. Now let the *purpose* with which he quotes them be carefully observed. Here is an Anglican writer who *both* avows his own belief in Church authority, and witnesses to its actual existence in the early Church. But Dr. Wiseman quotes him only in evidence of the latter fact, not in any sense as an indication (as far as an individual can be) of the *doctrine* of his Church. It seems, then, Jeremiah Jones's conclusions are to be substituted for our real ones; and then our own premises made

* Dr. Wiseman is mistaken in saying that it came out under Dr. Burton's sanction.

to tell against ourselves. We differ from Dr. Wiseman in logic as much as in divinity.

However, in consideration of the uses which he may supply in our warfare with Separatism, and similar evils of the day, we are almost willing to forgive Dr. Wiseman the above combined offences. He cannot lastingly obscure the character and genius of the English Church, though his mistakes about it may mislead others for a time. He cannot long be ignorant himself; he will shortly grow impatient of such authorities as "the celebrated Richard Baxter," or Mr. Hartwell Horne, or Mr. Tottenham, or the Jubilators of 1835, and crave after the more solid food supplied by Bramhall and Laud, Field and Hammond, Bull and Beveridge: or, at least, if such folios are not to be found in Rome, he can take with him thither Bishop Jebb's pocket volume of "Pastoral Instructions," which will give him in a few pages abundant authorities for the views which have been above maintained; and when he arrives at a truer view of the English Church, he will cease to apply to it what does not really apply, and will direct his arms against our Dissenters, who are his legitimate victims, and whom we surrender to him to plague and persecute in Moorfields, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, and any other field but Smithfield.

As a specimen of his powers that way, we will present our readers with several passages from his Lectures. He argues, from the structure of the Bible, and the circumstances under which it comes to us, that it was not intended to be the instrument of teaching individuals the Christian doctrine. It is common for Ultra-Protestants to argue, on the other hand, that a written record must be the sole instrument of revealed teaching, *because* oral tradition is in its nature vague and uncertain. We, however, follow Bishop Butler, in considering that none of us antecedently knows any thing, or can determine any thing, about what is likely or unlikely as to God's way and degree of communicating to mankind supernatural truths; that Providence often gives us a little knowledge and obscure notices; and that the very least is more than man has a right to ask. The following argument of Dr. Wiseman also, in part, offends against Butler's principle, and so far can only be looked upon as a good *argumentum ad hominem*; but with a slight alteration it may be made to escape this defect, and rise to a higher level:—

"We are to suppose that God gave his Holy Word to be the only rule of faith to all men. It must be a rule, therefore, easy to be procured, and to be held. God himself must have made the necessary provision, that all men should have it, and be able to apply it. What, then, does he do? He gives us a large volume written in two languages, the chief portion in one known to a small and limited country of the

world. He allows that speech to become a dead language, so that countless difficulties and obscurities should spring up regarding the meaning of innumerable passages. The other portion he gives in a language spoken by a large body of mankind, but still by a very small proportion, considering the extent of those to whom the blessings of Christianity were intended to be communicated; and he gives this book as a satisfactory and sufficient rule.

“ 1. In the first place, then, he expects it to be translated into every language, that all men may have access to it. In the second place, it must be so distributed, that all men may have possession of it; and, in the third place, it must be so easy that all men may use it. Are these the characteristics of this rule? Suppose it to be the only rule of all who believe in Christ, are you aware of the difficulty of undertaking a translation of it? Whenever the attempt has been made, in modern times, in the first instance it has generally failed; and even after many repeated attempts, it has proved unsatisfactory. Had I time, or were it necessary, I could show you, from various Reports of the Bible Society, and from the acknowledgment of its members, that many versions, after having been diffused among the natives of countries to be converted, have been necessarily withdrawn, on account of the absurdities, impieties, and innumerable errors which they contained. And this is the rule that has been put into the hands of men! But look to the history of even more celebrated translations, such as are put forth by authority. I speak not of those early versions which were made when the knowledge of the facts and circumstances was fresh, and when those who wrote better understood the language. But look at any modern version, such as that authorized in these realms. Read the account of how often it was corrected, what combinations of able and learned men it required to bring it to a tolerable degree of perfection. Then its worth, as a rule, must depend upon the skill and fitness of individuals for the task of translating; and we cannot suppose that the providence of God would stake the whole usefulness and value of his rule upon the private or particular abilities of man. And this is the first difficulty to its being considered the ordinary rule appointed of God.

“ 2. Secondly, what are the difficulties attending its diffusion. Oh, my brethren! could we look at this consideration in another age from the present, you might better understand them. You fancy, possibly, that because Bibles are now multiplied by thousands, and by millions, their application as a rule is obvious and easy; that because there is one nation on the globe possessed of immense wealth and mighty empire, and have ships that frequent the farthest bounds of earth; that because there are men willing to devote their time, and wealth, and zeal, to the publication and diffusion of these books; that because, in this country, and at the present time, a combination of political, commercial, and literary circumstances facilitate this distribution, therefore the rule is sufficiently accessible to all mankind. But God does not plan the rule of his faith in accordance with the possible literary or commercial prosperity of any country; nor so construct the groundwork of his truth as to depend upon the mechanical inventions of man. The Gospel's being the rule of faith

can have no connexion with the circumstance, that the press, by the aid of the strongest mechanical power applied to it, has now produced the Bible in measureless abundance. God could not mean that, for 1,400 years, man was to be without a guide, and that mankind should have to wait until human genius had given efficacy to it by its discoveries and inventions. Such cannot be the qualities or conditions of the rule. We must look for it as one for all times, and for all places; as something coming into operation as soon as delivered, and destined to last until the end of time. We cannot, therefore, admit, as the only necessary rule of faith, that which depends for its adoption on the accidental instrumentality of man, and requires essentially his unprescribed co-operation.

“For I think, that, on reflection, any unprejudiced mind will rather wonder how, in the Word of God, there should have been no provision made for this important condition. Why do we never find any precept given to the Apostles to disseminate the Scriptures, after having them translated into all languages? How comes it that no intimation is ever given therein of the duty of ministers to provide copies of the sacred volume for those whom they are bound to instruct? If this dissemination of the written word was and is an essential part of Christianity, and if in Scripture alone is to be found the rule and criterion of all that is essential, how comes this important provision to be there omitted? Nay, as our acquaintance with history proves to us the utter impossibility of the Bible's being extensively circulated without the aid of the press, why was not its invention provided for, as the necessary instrument for arriving at the rule and groundwork of faith? Surely the Bible Society is no part of the economy and machinery of Christianity, and yet, without it, the Scriptures could not have been diffused to the extent which we have witnessed in modern times.”—vol. i. p. 44—46.

The following remarks on the words in the Apostolic Commission, (Matth. xxviii. 20,) “Lo, I am with you always,” &c., seem to us truly important and valuable. It will be observed they are used by Dr. Wiseman to prove the absolute *infallibility* of the Church, i. e. in communion with Rome; they seem, however, quite as clearly and fully satisfied by what we see at this day—the indefectibility of the *whole* Church; whether united to Rome or not, in fundamentals. The passage, however, is very striking, and much to the purpose when directed against Ultra-Protestants.

“On examining the practice of Scripture we find, that whenever God gives a commission of peculiar difficulty, and one which to those that receive it appears almost, or indeed entirely, beyond the power of man, the way in which he assures them that it can and will be fulfilled, is by adding to the end of the commission, ‘*I will be with you.*’ As if he should thereby say, ‘the success of your commission is quite secure, because I will give my special assistance for its perfect fulfilment.’ A few passages will make this position quite clear.

“In the 40th chapter of Genesis, 3d and 4th verses, God says to Jacob, ‘I am God, the God of thy father; fear not to go down into

Egypt, for I will make thee a great people. *I will go down with thee into Egypt.* That is, I will accompany thee, I will be with thee, and therefore fear not. This assurance is added as a special guarantee for the truth of the promise, that the descendants of Jacob should be a great people. They were to become, by fulfilling the command given them, subjects of another state: their chances of becoming a mighty nation seemed greatly lessened; yet God pledged his word that he would so protect them that the promise should be fulfilled, and this he does by adding the assurance, *'I will go down with thee.'* But this is still clearer in the book of Exodus, where the Almighty commands Moses to go unto Pharaoh and liberate his people. He execute this commission! who had been obliged to flee from Egypt under a capital imputation—who was now not only devoid of interest at court, but was identified with that very proscribed and persecuted race, whose extermination Pharaoh had vowed—who, should he come forward, could only ensure his own destruction, and the more certain frustration of the hopes which God had given to his captive people! How then does God assure him, that in spite of all these apparent impossibilities he shall be successful? 'And Moses said unto God, Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt? And he said unto him, *I will be with thee.*' The fulfilment is secure, no other assurance is given; Moses has the strongest guarantee that God can propose to him that he will be successful. Again, when Jeremiah is sent to preach to his people, and considers himself unfit for the commission, God promises him success in the same terms, and with the very introductory phrase used in the commission given to the Apostles, 'and behold!' and with no other less extraordinary coincidences. In the first chapter of that Prophet (verses 17—19) we thus read, 'gird up thy loins, and arise and *speak unto them all that I command thee; and behold!* I have made thee this day a walled city. . . . And they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail, *for I am with thee*, saith the Lord.' Here is a command given precisely such as we have seen delivered to the Apostles, to tell the people *all that God had commanded*; and to it is appended the very same form of assurance as is addressed to them.

"Thus, therefore, we have a clear axiom deduced from the simple examination of similar forms in other parts of Scripture, that whenever a commission is given by God to accomplish what appears impossible by human means, he guarantees its complete success and perfect execution by adding the words 'I am with thee.' And thus we have a right to conclude, that in the text under examination Christ, by the same words, promised to his Apostles and to those who should succeed them till the end of the world, such a similar scheme of especial providence as shall be necessary and sufficient to secure the full accomplishment of the commission therewith to them given. We have consequently only to see what the commission is, and the case is closed. 'Go teach all nations;' that is one part of the commission to teach all the nations of the world. And what are the things to be taught? '*To observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you!*' Therefore we have the guarantee

of Christ that he will aid his church with a special and efficacious providence, *to teach all things* that he has commanded to all nations, and till the end of time.

“I ask you, is not this a commission exactly comprising all that I said we might expect to find? Does it not institute a body of men to whom Christ has given security that they shall be faithful depositories of his truths? Does it not constitute the kingdom whereunto all nations should come? Does it not establish therein his own permanent teaching in lieu of prophecy, so as to prevent all error from entering into the church? and is not this church to last till the end of time? Now this is precisely all that the Catholic Church teaches, all that she claims and holds as the basis and foundation whereupon to build her rule of faith. The successors of the Apostles in the church of Christ have received the security of his own words and his promise of ‘a perpetual teaching,’ so that they shall not be allowed to fall into error. It is this promise which assures her she is the depository of all truth, and is gifted with an exemption from all liability to err, and has authority to claim from all men, and from all nations, submission to her guidance and instruction.”—pp. 107—109.

We do not see cause for disagreeing with Dr. Wiseman, till we come to the *application* of the above statement. He considers all the tenets of the Church of Rome as part of the “all things whatsoever;” we think that those in which it differs from the Church Apostolic and Catholic are not so. He would say the doctrine of Purgatory was part; we say it is a human addition. He says it is divine, because the Roman Church holds it; we say it is not, because the Church Catholic does not. But this is altogether a subsequent question. The doctrine which the above extract illustrates is very solemn, and Dr. Wiseman writes with a good deal of feeling and eloquence.

We shall but direct attention to Dr. Wiseman’s remarks on the different success which has attended the preaching of Catholics and Ultra-Protestants, and then bring this review to an end. *Audi alteram partem* is a necessary rule; so we must wait to hear what the party assailed will say against him, before we form a judgment, especially since the above examination of Dr. Wiseman’s treatment of the Anglican doctrine does not inspire us with any great confidence in the completeness or evenness of any inquiry of his in which the interests of his own Church are concerned. All that can be said is, that he professes to cite Protestant witnesses in his review of the Protestant Missions; whereas his judgment of the English Church is formed from doctrines held by enemies or strangers to her.

He observes that the practical success of the Protestant (Ultra-Protestant) or Catholic (Roman) Rule of Faith (i. e. mode of teaching) in converting heathen nations, must necessarily be a test

of the divinity of the one or the other, since success was promised to the true preaching of the Gospel, when it was said, "Lo, I am with you always." And he then proceeds to argue that Romanism has had most remarkable success in its missions in heathen countries, and that Ultra-Protestants, though attempting much more, have done little or nothing. Of recent missions from the latter party, he mentions the Baptist Missionary Society, instituted in 1792; the London, in 1795; the Scotch, in 1796; the Church, in 1800; and the Wesleyans and others since. Others also have been lately founded in America, Germany and France, and have exerted themselves with extraordinary zeal and diligence in their momentous object. The expenditure on the whole in the work of conversion was said, in 1824, to amount to £1000 a day, or £365,000 *per annum*. In addition to this charitable outlay, the Bible Society, in 1835, expended above £125,000; and in the course of the last thirty-one years above two millions sterling, in great measure for the same purposes; and has circulated, with other similar societies in Europe and America, above fifteen million copies of the Scriptures. "If the true way of working conversion," says Dr. Wiseman, "be the dispersion of the Written Word, surely an abundant harvest might by this time have been expected."—p. 168. By a subsequent statement he shows that the present yearly income of Missionary Societies is even £300,000 more than the foregoing calculations give, though probably in this account are included some Societies, as that for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which have really no place there. He then notices the government grants, though here again he includes the English Church in his survey; whereas its fortunes, whether prosperous or otherwise, do not come under a review of the proceedings of Societies which consider the Bible as the appointed means of conversion. Next he calculates the number of missionaries employed, and considers it to amount to 3000, exclusive of Americans and other foreigners, which he supposes to be three or four times the number employed by the Church of Rome. The allowance of these missionaries has sometimes been as high as £100 a year; in others, particularly in Asia, as high as £240, with £40 additional for every wife, and £20 more for every fresh child. Dr. Wiseman also speaks of the political advantages which Englishmen enjoy in India.

He then professes to go through the returns of conversion and reports of the progress of the Gospel in different countries, and sums up after the following manner: that in India, for instance, the utmost number of converts in a course of years is twelve in one place, four in another, and four in another, and so on; that among the Calmucks, the Moravians had been employed fifty-six

years without making one convert; and that Mr. Bickersteth declared, in 1823, that in the course of the first ten years the Church Missionary Society never heard of a single individual who passed from Idolatry to Christianity. He then describes at length the manner and effect with which the Bible Society acts in heathen countries.

“ You must not allow yourselves to be led away by those Reports which speak of the immense number of copies of the Bible and the New Testament distributed among the natives of heathen countries,—you must not suppose that this gives any evidence of conversion,—or that, because missionaries ask for innumerable quantities of Bibles, any thing like a proportionable number of conversions are made. For these Bibles are sent out in cargoes, and accumulated in warehouses abroad, or distributed to persons who make no use of them at all, or make them serve any purpose, as you will see by a few examples, which I will give you just now. General Hislop, for instance, in his ‘ History of the Campaign against the Mahrattas and Pindarris,’ says, that ‘ these missionaries think that this distribution of the Gospels in Chinese, Sanscrit, &c., is sufficient to obtain their purpose; and as they send out these books to English agents and magistrates, in different places, so they reckon the number of their converts, and the success of their labours, in proportion to the copies distributed.’ He says, that he knew several residences where no vessel ever arrived without a case or bale of Bibles for distribution. The residents send them in every direction, by hundreds at a time. The Chinese look at them, and say that they have more beautiful histories in their own literature, and have not the least idea whether they are intended for amusement or instruction, and, after having read them, throw them aside; so that the resident could not possibly distribute any more: but the ardent zeal of the Malacca missionary continued to supply them, by ship after ship, in such quantities that they were obliged to be placed in a warehouse! He adds, that ‘ this is the missionary who had written to the Bible Society that they might send him out a million of Bibles; and in this way it would have been easy to dispose of them.’

“ I have also seen a letter, and will quote it, although it is from a Catholic authority, written a few years ago by the Vicar Apostolic of Siam, who relates precisely the same circumstance,—‘ That two English emissaries had arrived, and were distributing Bibles in every direction; the people used them to wrap up their merchandize in the shops; some of them, however, brought them to the Catholic clergy as of no use.’ He then remarks, ‘ in this way reports are sent over, and the number of converts are reckoned by the number of Bibles distributed. I know that not a single conversion has been made by them.’

“ In the French ‘ Asiatic Journal,’ we are assured, on the authority of a letter from Macao, that copies of Dr. Morrison’s Bible, which had been introduced into China, were afterwards sold by auction; and that the greater part of them were bought by manufacturers for different purposes, but principally by the makers of slippers, which they used to line with them! It is painful, and humiliating, and unbecoming the so-

lemnity of this place, to mention such circumstances; but they are important towards undeceiving those who think that all these Bibles are put to a useful purpose, instead of this degrading and disrespectful use being made of the Word of God."—vol. i. p. 198—200.

Such are some of the exceptions which Dr. Wiseman takes to the Protestant missions. When he turns to the Roman Catholic, he is, perhaps, less to be trusted, it being easier to be candid towards an opponent whom we do not fear, than impartial in our own case. If we are to take his account as it stands, Romanism has a success among the heathen, inferior indeed, but similar to that which attended the preaching of the first propagators of the Gospel. Nor are we unwilling to allow, that it has so much of the blessing of the true Church with it, as to have a measure of success, which Ultra-Protestant efforts, however zealous and praiseworthy in themselves, will not experience. We will but cite the contrast he draws between the conduct of the Dutch Calvinists and Romanists in the Island of Ceylon, which, if it may be trusted, is a remarkable instance of this.

"I will enter into some details respecting a portion of the Indian Church, that in the island of Ceylon, to show you how far this reasoning is correct; and I think it presents a case which will put the two ground-works of faith on a fair comparison. This island was first converted to Christianity in the following way:—The natives having heard of what was doing by St. Francis Xavier on the continent, sent a messenger, or rather an embassy, to him, requesting him to come among them. He replied that he could not go in person at that moment, as he could not abandon the mission at Travancore, but sent another missionary, who baptized many natives; after two years St. Francis landed there in person, and finished the work of conversion. Persecution soon arose; the king of Jaffnapatam put six hundred Christians to death in one year, and among them his own eldest son; so that this church may be said to have been watered by the blood of martyrs.

"In 1650 the Dutch became masters of the island, and instantly took two very important steps. The first was, as Dr. Davies tells us in his travels, to allow Wimaladarme, son of Raja Singhe, to send messengers to Siam for twelve Buddhist idolatrous priests of the highest order. These came to Candy, and ordained twelve natives to the same order, and many to the lower order; and thus they restored the religion of Buddha for the purpose of extirpating Catholicity from the island. In the second place they excluded the Catholic bishops and priests from the country, and forbade the natives to meet for religious purposes; they built Protestant churches in every parish throughout the island, and compelled every one to attend that worship; and they allowed no one to hold any post or office unless he subscribed the Protestant profession of faith.

"Here, then, we have a church established for less than a century, which yet had obtained a strong footing in the island. After this

we have another religion introduced, and every thing done to counteract and destroy what had been effected in favour of the other by a double method; first, by giving those who were so inclined permission to return to their old superstitions, and affording these protection and means of propagation; and secondly, by proscription, and by endeavouring to substitute in its stead the Protestant religion. For 150 years, till it came into the possession of the English, the island of Ceylon remained in this state. During all this time the native Catholics had no spiritual succour but what they received from the Portuguese priests of the order of St. Philip Neri, who landed there from time to time at the risk of their lives, and administered the sacraments privately, going from house to house. We have an interesting account given by the missionary D. Pedro Cubero Sebastian, how during the time of this persecution he landed, and disguising his character applied to the governor Pavellon for leave to remain some time in the town of Colombo. Leave was given him, on condition that a guard of soldiers should constantly accompany him, as he was suspected. He contrived however to elude their vigilance, and having lulled the attention of his guards in the middle of the night, assembled the whole Christian community of the place, and administered to them the comforts of religion. The transaction was discovered, he was immediately sent for by the governor, and ordered instantly to quit the island. He did so, and landed on the other side, but found that in the meantime a courier had arrived over land to put the governor of that district, Hoblout, on his guard. A still more severe guardianship was the result; but in the middle of the night he again assembled the Christians, and administered the sacraments.

“These attempts, however, were not always so successful; for we learn that while Father Joseph Vaz, a zealous Portuguese missionary of the order of Oratorians, was celebrating mass on Christmas night for a congregation of 200 persons, they were suddenly surprised by guards, who broke in the door and carried the entire congregation, men, women and children to prison. They were very cruelly treated, and next morning brought before the Dutch judge, Van Rheede, who dismissed the women and imposed fines on the men. Eight of these, however, were reserved to a severer doom, of whom one, a recent convert from Protestantism, was put to death with studied cruelty; the other seven were condemned, after a severe scourging, to irons and hard labour for life.

“Such were the means resorted to to put down the church which had been established by St. Francis in that island; and this course was continued for 150 years, until the British took possession of it in 1795. Indeed the laws which proscribed the Catholic religion were not repealed till 1806, when Sir Alexander Johnston, to whom the Catholics of that part of the world owe more than they can repay, obtained equality for all religions, and consequently the free exercise of ours.

“And what do you think has been the consequence of this step? Hear how Dr. Buchanan speaks on the subject:—‘In the island of Ceylon, in which, by a calculation made in 1801, there were 342,000 Protestants—it is a well known fact that more than 50,000 have gone

over to the Catholic religion from want of teachers in their own religion.' So that within a few years after liberty was restored, more than 50,000 have returned to the faith originally planted there, and afterwards crushed by persecution. 'The ancient Protestant churches,' he farther observes, 'some of which are spacious buildings, and which, in the province of Jaffnapatam alone, amount to thirty-two, are now occupied at will by the Catholic priests of the order of St. Philip Neri, who have taken quiet possession of the island. If a remedy be not speedily applied, we may calculate that, in a few years, the island of Ceylon will be in the same situation as Ireland, as to the proportion between Catholics and Protestants. I must further add, however painful the reflection may be, that the defection to idolatry, in many districts, is very rapid.'

"Here, then, are the results of an attempt to establish the Protestant religion, by building and endowing churches, and by doing precisely all that the Catholics did in the peninsula of India; and see what has been the event; that there were 340,000 Protestants in this neighbouring island, and the moment the pressure of the law is taken off, 50,000 returned to the Catholic faith, and a great many of the rest went back to their old idolatry!"—vol. i. p. 231—234.

If it be inquired why the English Church has done so little here and elsewhere in the way of missions to the heathen, an obvious reason may be assigned without reflecting either upon its principles or its members. There is zeal and charity in abundance within it, but political influences have prevented its using them. It is commonly understood that Archbishop Secker wished to impart the Succession to the American colonies, but was forbidden by the government of the day, although he asked for no civil privileges for the bishops he should send them, but merely such countenance as other forms of Christianity might enjoy. Ever since the State took on itself the care and disposal of the Church, it has been very jealous of its forming foreign relations, or advancing one step towards the realization of that Catholicity which is an essential element of the Christian spirit. It has shown a special unwillingness that the Church should learn (as it were) to walk alone, as if it would enforce as the very tenure of its establishment, that it should have no substantive existence except in the framework of the constitution. Zeal, therefore, was for a period a superfluous virtue in the Church; and having no legitimate outlet for its exercise, it turned to the injury of those sacred interests which it was intended to subserve. What was by nature missionary became schismatical. Wesley, instead of being the founder of a Church in America or China, as he might, perhaps, have been, dwindled into a separatist and heresiarch, and drew from the mother he loved some of her best and most generous blood. The civil power saw without concern events which weakened an ally, which was most useful to itself, except when it became

too powerful. This answer ought to satisfy such as think fit to object to our Church, what has in fact been its misfortune; and if Romanists consider they see cause for triumph in it, as if we had thrown ourselves into the arms of the State, and were but suffering as all should suffer who take rash steps, we would refer them to the condition of their own Church from A. D. 1000 to 1080, and remind them that one or two centuries are but a span in the history of an institution which has lasted almost two millenaries, and will outlive all other dynasties and politics, however powerful and however tyrannical in their day.

ART. VII.—*Physical Theory of another Life.* By the Author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm.* London. William Pickering. 1836. 8vo. Pp. 321.

IN our notice of Dr. Turton's volume, in the last Number, we have already contended that the doctrines of immortality and future retribution are truths of natural religion:—that all the great workings of man's moral nature proceed upon their assumption. We have asserted that all men—without revelation—*cannot but* have these inalienable convictions. And yet, nevertheless, revelation confers upon us the most solemn obligations by *her* announcements respecting them. She has removed much of the painful vagueness by which their value and influence had been seriously deteriorated. She has brought them at least from star-light into dawn. She has conducted us downward to the abysses of a dungeon, of the existence of which she found us more than apprehensive, and has partially disclosed its dark, dank, impenetrable walls,—its groans,—its eternity,—and the passage of descent;—she has ascended with us to the regions of bliss, shown us the path thither, but arriving “fast by the throne of God,” her light hath evanished, absorbed in that effulgence unto which no man can approach.

It is therefore obvious that natural religion and revealed religion give us but imperfect information, taking them apart. But it is deserving our consideration whether they might not mutually assist each other in guiding our further investigations respecting another life. Must our theory comprise nothing but what reason and inspiration definitely assert? Have they thrown out no hints, no “ambiguas voces,” which it would be wise in us to attempt to interpret? That any investigations we may make must unavoidably be hypothetical, is admitted; but even hypothesis, when cautiously conducted, is better than nothing as a means of science, where induction is impossible. And so long as we keep in mind those doctrines of our faith in regard to futurity, which God has

vouchsafed to us, as a line with which all our hypothetical conjectures must be parallel, we shall avoid presumption and practical error, and at least indulge a habitude of mind elevating and heavenly.

We have submitted whether we may not justifiably employ ourselves in carefully evolving from the *general* truths of reason and revelation concerning a future life, some minuter specifications; whether there are not certain fields pointed out, in which a laudable conjecture upon what will be the modes of our condition hereafter, may be allowed to roam. The analogies of nature favour our belief that "death may immediately, in the natural course of things, put us into a higher and more enlarged state of life, as our birth does; a state in which our capacities and sphere of perception and of action, may be much greater than at present."* And the Scriptures affirm that "there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body;" "that now we know but in part, but then shall we know even as also we are known;" that as to "tongues, they shall cease." All these are general doctrines, and they involve innumerable particulars;—shall we not even attempt to conjecture these particulars? They are roots—shall we indulge no suppositions as to their possible ramifications? Or to illustrate it by a science once so despised as hypothetical; they are like the disjointed fragments of osteology—may we not, guided by broad analogies, reason thence what will be the entire, complete form and structure of those beings, of whom these will unquestionably be attributes?

Much, therefore, though we shall have to complain of the author of the volume before us, for the manner in which he has executed it, we cannot but approve of the nature and tendency of his investigation. His first chapter is filled with the preliminary cautions, First, that the imagination should be allowed no indulgence, during the speculation, the only proper instrument of discovery being a careful analysis of human nature, as "the rudiment of a more extended and desirable mode of existence;" Secondly, that no hypothesis, formed upon the subject, how plausible soever it might be, should be regarded as any thing more than a conjecture, or be allowed to disturb any of our religious convictions; Thirdly, that the sacred canon should always be respected and reverted to as an infallible means of keeping ourselves near the true path of inquiry.

* Butler's Analogy, Part I. chap. 1. § 3. Note. This, according to Strabo, was the opinion of the Brahmans: νομίζουσιν μὲν γὰρ δὴ τὸν μὲν ἐνθάδε βίον, ὡς ἂν ἀκμὴν κυομένην εἶναι· τὸν δὲ θάνατον γένεσιν εἰς τὸν ὄντως βίον, καὶ τὸν εὐδαίμονα τοῖς φιλοσοφῆσαι. Τοῦ ὅτι ἡ ἀπόψυχος ἐκ τῆς γαστρὸς τῆς γυναικὸς σου ἐξέλθῃ, οὕτως ἐκδέχεσθαι τὴν ὥραν ἐν ᾗ τὸ ψυχάριον σου τοῦ ἐλύτρου τούτου ἐκπεσῇται. Lib. 9, c. 3.

The fundamental principle of his theory, he gathers from the affirmation of St. Paul in the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, "There is a *natural* body and there is a *spiritual* body." And thence he concludes that "the Christian Scriptures affirm the simple physiological fact of two species of corporeity, destined for man; the first, that of our present animal and dissoluble organization, which we share, in all its conditions, with the irrational sentient tribes around us; and the second, a future spiritual structure, imperishable, and endowed with higher powers, and many desirable prerogatives."

Thus far then it is ascertained that in the future world the soul is to be embodied in a habitation far loftier in order and capacity than its present one. The next step of the investigation concerns the probable prerogatives of this future human body, but before taking it, the author conceives it "natural that we should first state what appear to be the essential conditions of corporeity, whether animal or spiritual, so that before we come to ask wherein the spiritual body shall excel the animal body, we may understand what it is in which the two must be supposed to agree."

The second chapter points out those supposed instances of agreement. We shall simply enumerate them at present, and until we have glanced through the work defer our opinion upon their value. The author conceives that mind *unembodied* can have no relation either to place or to time; is unsusceptible of pains or pleasures produced by the material world; is incapable of exerting any power upon matter; is unimaginary; is destitute of the requisites of sociality. Wherever the soul is incarnate it localizes itself, and by time admeasures its movements; is fitted for organic sensibilities and powers; can indulge itself in emotions partly organic and partly intellectual; and by its palpable individuality and form, can carry on intercourse. And since the mind hereafter is to be embodied, it will be just as relative to space,—just as conscious of duration,—just as alive to animal impressions and animal effort,—just as poetic in its creations, and just as social, as at present.

Having shown the instances of agreement between the present and the future human body, we proceed to the instances of *probable* disagreement; or "in what manner the actual powers of the present structure of human nature may be conceived of as expanded or advantaged, consistently with those great principles of analogy which we find to characterize the divine operations in all their departments."

In the *first* place; the power of the mind to originate motion may be conceived of as indefinitely increased hereafter. In the

second place, the channels of communication between mind and matter, namely, the senses, may be multiplied; there may be more than five. Thirdly, our powers of perception may be made so microscopic, that the minor forms and workings of creation may be laid bare to us. Fourthly; by these new endowments of the body the mind itself may be advantaged; for instance, the power of memory is affected by the condition of the brain;—the brain of the spiritual body may act so advantageously upon the memory then, that forgetfulness will be impossible. And again, our powers of thought, in energy, in continuity, in capacity for simultaneous operations and intuitive perception, in independence of language for communication, and finally in entire mastery and control of the whole system, may be the results of this same organic improvement.

These several particulars are discussed in distinct chapters. The author then remarks, “that each of these points of supposed advantage—each conjectural prerogative of the spiritual body, stands evenly balanced between happiness and suffering, as a means of augmenting, indifferently, the one or the other.” It is clear that as suffering as well as bliss must enter into our contemplation of a future world; whatever faculties the spiritual body is endowed with, must—should it be the object of punishment—only increase its susceptibilities of anguish.

The eleventh chapter is a speculation upon the exterior conformation or the visible structure of the future human body. It is conjectured, that the body of our unfallen progenitor will be the model, the die, used in the new world. Nevertheless there may be this distinction,—that the spiritual body will display the infinite resources of the creative intelligence by “*the harmony of the principles*” upon which it will be constructed, instead, as in the natural body, of “*the complexity of parts.*”

The twelfth chapter is an argument, that the transition from our present animal to our future spiritual incorporation is not a miraculous but a natural process. The daily and hourly vegetable and animal transitions which we perceive going on around us, furnish us with those natural metamorphoses which are justly analogous to our future corporeal renovation, upon the principle suggested by the inspired advocate, “thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.”

The thirteenth and fourteenth chapters are intended to show that our mental and moral identity will survive the transition, and that, as it respects the regions of bliss, those virtues which are *now* exhibitory of holiness,—such as fortitude, and resignation, and courage,—will even then have scope; for however elevated our knowledge, there will still be mysteries in which we must ac-

quiesce,—and however mighty our prowess, there will still be appointed deeds of moral daring.

The remaining chapters are so gratuitously conjectural, and we will say so regardless of that sound analogy to which the author at first professed such solemn allegiance, that we deem it unnecessary to epitomise them. Suffice it, that they are merely imaginings upon the relation which the future world may bear to ~~other~~ orders of the material and intellectual universe. The book concludes with some remarks upon the *general* science of pneumatology,

And now for our honest opinion upon this new work by the author of “The Natural History of Enthusiasm,” first, as it regards its literary ; and, secondly, its theological merits. The time is come when the “Annuals” of this writer are not to be received with a sparing gentleness. His tone has been always lofty, sometimes dictatorial. He would have us listen to his suggestions as those of a spirit standing upon a moral acclivity, in an atmosphere of unprejudiced calmness, watching the petty strifes of mortals, and thence issuing forth his superior estimate of the merits of the quarrel ;—or, while soaring himself in fields of free and elastic thought, pitying the poor wretches of this mundane system for their limited and creeping movement. His first work upon “Enthusiasm” was welcomed, and his faults overlooked, for the sake of the author’s literary youth. But we well recollect the laconic critique upon that volume given in conversation by an illustrious master of the English language, and a “great man in Israel,” when he designated it “*splendid nonsense*.” We know no better description of the present speculation. Our remarks *now* are confined to its literary value. Take, for instance, such passages as these :—

Speaking of the supposable increased power of the glorified soul in the spiritual body to originate motion, he says :

“Let it however be supposed that muscular action takes place in the circuitous mode of chemical excitement, which we have stated ; and in this case it is easy to conceive of the very same power (nor need it be greater) acting upon, or through the medium of a corporeal structure absolutely infrangible, and indestructible ; and it would then suffice for effecting locomotion by impulsion upon a resisting medium in a manner analogous to the flight of birds, but greatly surpassing it in velocity. This supposition, though easily admitted, we should not entertain ; but should prefer the hypothesis that, in the future spiritual body, whether or not the mechanical apparatus shall be altogether superseded, the entire corporeal mass shall be liable to a plenary mental influence, equally diffused, and although still subject to the *vis inertiae* and gravitation that are proper to matter, both shall be overcome, at will, by the embodied mind, so that the locomotion of the whole shall

follow volition, as now the relative motion of the limbs follows it. This we consider to imply nothing more than the setting the inherent mechanical power of the mind at large, and the breaking up its restriction to the muscular structure and the osseous articulations. A body thus informed throughout, by the energy of mind, might be either subtile and ethereal, like the magnetic fluid ; or it might be as dense and ponderous as gold or as adamant ; for the most elastic gas is in itself not at all more self-motive than a block of granite ; and it is a mere illusion to imagine that the one might more readily be effected by the volitions of mind than the other. *The seraph who steers his course at pleasure from sun to sun, and who overtakes the swiftest of the planets in its orbit, may corporeally possess an invisible and imponderable ether, or (which is equally credible) he may command a gigantic body, solid as porphyry.* The two suppositions stand on the same ground of abstract probability ; for matter, in relation to mind, is one and the same, and always inert and passive."—pp. 51, 52.

Be it recollected that this is not intended for Miltonic imagination, but grave, philosophical conjecture.

Again :

" But then every faculty has its impulse, and, when repressed, its wrestling uneasiness ; and this species of agony bears proportion to the inherent extent and the energy of that faculty. And if now, when the locomotive power has but a very narrow range ; and when the exercise of it, although pleasurable at first, very soon produces fatigue and pain—if now, we say, corporeal restraint and imprisonment be one of the most intolerable of bodily ills, what shall imprisonment be when the locomotive energy is a thousand times more vehement than at present, and when the exercise of it is attended with no conscious effort, and is followed by no lassitude, and when the widest and the fairest fields shall lie before it ? The chain of the captive is galling, just in proportion, or nearly so, to the captive's animal vigour and elastic spirit. Let it then be imagined that the future man, new born to his inheritance of absolute mechanical force—the inherent force of mind, and finding himself able at will to traverse all spaces, should, in the very hour wherein he has made proof of his recent faculty, be stopped, either by malignant superior powers, or by the dread ministers of justice, and, on account of forgotten misdeeds, be seized, enchained, incarcerated ! *Might we not, with a rational consistency, and in conformity with some of the actual procedures of the present social system, imagine, for example, the merciless tyrant, who in cold revenge has held the innocent in his dungeons through long years, or the ruffian slave-dealer, just bursting from the thralls of mortality, and proudly careering through mid-heaven ; but only to encounter there some more fierce and stronger than himself, who, with mockery showing their warrant from Eternal Justice, shall grapple with his young vigour, hale him to the abyss, find there a chain strong enough to bind him, and rivet him to the rock, where he is to chafe, and taste the retributive miseries of captivity, and the fruitless strivings and writhings of a power sufficient, if it were not bound, to bear him from star to star !* All this is

so credible abstractedly, and so readily conceived of on the ground of common facts, that one can hardly think of it otherwise than as actually true."—pp. 124, 126.

There are innumerable passages such as these, full, even to nausea, with the worst bombast. And there is, moreover, a perpetual recurrence of the pettiest species of verbal affectation. "Corporeity" instead of "body," "telluric" instead of "earthly," "reluctates" for "hesitates," "survivance" for "survival," "passivity" for "passiveness," "adits" for "avenues!" Verily, "from our souls we loathe all affectation," but, most of all, in a man whose pretensions to disinterested rebuke and absorbing contemplations demand sincere simplicity. Already this "fine" writer has had sufficient indications, in his waning popularity, that there is too much good taste yet among us to tolerate his absurd Latinisms. Were it in our power, the next task we would assign him would be the study of the severe but immortal beauties of Xenophon and Aristotle. This would cure his rhapsody.

But we come now to inquire into the value of his speculations. We are far from disposed to undervalue his theory, so far as it regards either the enlarged capacities which he supposes "the spiritual body" will possess, or the manner in which such corporeal improvement will affect the mind—its inhabitant. There is nothing unphilosophical in the conjecture, for instance, that our powers of locomotion, or of objective effort, may be indefinitely increased. In fact, we must admit it to be certain, in order that the enlarged activities and purposes of the master soul, may not be sources of disappointment and chagrin, rather than of pleasurable success. And, moreover, it involves no *physical* absurdity:—nevertheless, it is bare conjecture. The divine writings are totally silent upon the subject, unless it be implied in such a passage and its parallels as when the apostle in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, alluding to the coming of Christ, says, "Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." Even here there is a vagueness. It tells us not what power shall overcome the laws of gravitation,—whether a force extraneous, or suddenly infused,—when all, even those that "are not asleep shall be changed." We would therefore tremble at any forced scriptural interpretation.

What was our astonishment, we will say indignation, at the following specimen of "wresting the Scriptures!" The apologetic terms with which the author introduces it do not excuse him for even conceiving it, much less for gravely submitting it to his readers:—

"The author would be very slow to seek support to an argument such

as the one in hand from scriptural expressions, which probably ought to be interpreted in a spiritual sense only; he will, therefore, name the often quoted passage, (Isaiah, xl. 31,) as POSSIBLY *having a secondary reference to the future corporeal powers of the sons of God.*—‘They shall renew their strength—they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.’—!!

This is *literal* interpretation with a vengeance. Let us make the writer confute himself. The thirtieth verse, immediately preceding the above-quoted one, says. “Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall:”—“But they that wait upon the Lord, shall renew their strength.” How must this theologian expound the former in consonance with the latter? “They that wait upon the Lord” are, in his view, and correctly too, “the sons of God:” but to these are contrasted “the youths and young men,” evidently they who with the self-confidence of early years, trust in their own prowess rather than in God. *They* shall faint and fall. When, but—according to this interpreter, in a future life? And how, but in *their future corporeal powers*? that is, their physical energies will be *diminished*. And all this, while, as our readers must have already seen, he contends that both the blessed and the punished hereafter will have enlarged physical capacities, the one as media of delight, the other as media of endurance! But really this position is too absurd for a refutation.

While we are upon the point of Scriptural misinterpretation, we would call our readers to another instance of the author’s deficiency at least of judgment. In another chapter he adduces the passage “There are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial,—there is a natural body—and a spiritual body. Howbeit *that is not first* which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and *afterward* that which is spiritual.” Now, we are certain that true criticism would refer to the context for a correct apprehension of this doctrine. This is the previous verse; “The first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.” Then follows, “Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual.” Surely its meaning is quite palpable;—that in consequence of our relation to the *first* Adam, our forefather, we hold the present form of animal organization, the *natural* one,—but that in consequence of our relation to the Redeemer, the *second* Adam, we shall hold a future form of organization, the *spiritual* one;—But our relation to the Saviour did not precede, but came after, our relation to our progenitor. It was a *remedial* sequence upon our fall. What other significance will our readers conceive the author has attached to it?—“*That this order, or regular process,*

this transition, is the universal law of the intelligent creation!"*—That even the angelic beings have passed through it,—have been encrusted in dense matter, but in time have been renovated, and are now with spiritual frames before God! Then, of course, they must have died, for death is only the process of transition! Of course, they must have sinned, for death is sin's offspring! Of course, they have been redeemed, for they are now in bliss! Of course, the Saviour hath enacted substitutionary appointments heretofore! We contend that all these terrific consequences must follow upon such a gratuitous exposition.

The author has put forth his logical and metaphysical powers more particularly in the second chapter; and therein, we think, he has signally failed. It is, when he argues that mind must be embodied in order to have relation to *place* or *time*; in order to feel towards or act upon matter; to possess one of its prime faculties, imagination; or carry on communion with others.

The sacred writings reveal—we conceive—a state of consciousness in the interval between death and the resurrection, just as much as they reveal a resurrection. Our author's following assertion will not convince us to the contrary. "Let it then be distinctly kept in view, that although the essential independence of mind and matter, or the *abstract possibility* of the former existing apart from corporeal life, may well be considered as implied in the Christian scheme, yet an actual incorporeal state of the human soul, at any period of its course, is not necessarily involved in the principles of our faith, any more than it is explicitly asserted. This doctrine concerning what is called the immateriality of the soul, should ever be treated as a merely philosophical speculation, and as *unimportant to the Christian profession*. The question, then, concerning pure immateriality, we regard as having been passed, untouched, by St. Paul."† We deny that it is unimportant to our Christian profession. Is that, which throws around the darkest, dreariest hour of our existence—our passage through the shadow of death—the light of proximate bliss, *unimportant*? What can so nerve the Christian sufferer as the belief that but a few moments intervene between him and heaven?—What gave the racer in his course the power to make one last, daring plunge, with limbs faltering and breath expended, but the fact that it brought him *immediately* to the goal? We deny that the immediate sequence upon death is untouched by St. Paul. "Absent from the body, we are present with the Lord." Assuredly this establishes our immaterial existence, in which consciously we shall be with the Lord, and meanwhile possess power of sociality.

* Page 36.

† Page 11.

It is incumbent then upon us to examine, how far the laws of true philosophy consist with such a hope.

I. What are our author's opinions?

"And first, without question, we must affirm that Body is the necessary means of bringing Mind into relationship with space and extension, and so, of giving it—PLACE. Very plainly, a disembodied spirit, or, we should rather say, an unembodied spirit, or sheer mind, is NO WHERE. Place is a relation belonging to extension; and extension is a property of matter: but that which is wholly abstracted from matter, and in speaking of which we deny that it has any property in common therewith, can in itself be subject to none of its conditions; and we might as well say of a pure spirit that it is hard, heavy, or red, or that it is a cubic foot in dimensions, as say that it is *here* or *there*. It is only in a popular and improper sense that any such affirmation is made concerning the Infinite Spirit, or that we speak of God as *every where* present. God is in every place in a sense altogether incomprehensible by finite minds, inasmuch as his relation to space and extension is peculiar to infinitude. Using the terms as we use them of ourselves, God is not *here* or *there*, any more than he exists *now* and *then*. Although therefore the idea may not readily be seized by every one, we must nevertheless yield it to be true that, when we talk of an absolute immateriality, and wish to withdraw mind altogether from matter, we must no longer allow ourselves to imagine that it is, or can be, in any place, or that it has any kind of relationship to the visible and extended universe. But in combining itself with matter, by the means of a corporeal lodgment, mind brings itself into alliance with the various properties of the external world, and takes a share in the conditions of solidity and extension. Thenceforward mind occupies one place, at one time, moves from place to place, and may follow other minds, and be followed by others;—it may find and be found; it may be detained, or be set at large; it may go to and fro within a narrow circle, or it may traverse a wide circle; and while by this same means, the material universe is opened to its acquaintance, it is also restricted in its opportunities of acquiring knowledge by its subjection to the laws of gravitation and motion: we may then with some degree of confidence regard a corporeal state as indispensable to the exercise of active faculties, to a scheme of government, and to a social economy."—pp. 21—23.

We are not unaware of the useless logomachies in which disputes on such subjects are likely to involve us; but the author's speculation is too dangerous to be overlooked. He asserts, that body gives to mind *Place*.—Now if our good old college Locke is correct, "Place is the position of any body, when considered at a certain distance from some other; Place is the relation betwixt any thing and any two or more points, which are considered as keeping the same distance one with another, and so considered as at rest;" "Place is that space which any body takes up."

This relation the mind acquires, according to our author, by incorporation. That is, there is a certain point of space, which the mind fills, into which no other existence meanwhile can intrude, and which is a foot from one object, and a mile from another. Now this we deny can ever be said, physically, of pure spirit; in order to be locally relative *in its essence* it must fill some point of space, but if any existence fills space it possesses extension, it is *matter*. Now either the mind is, notwithstanding its incorporation, pure mind, or it is not. If it is *pure*, it cannot have place: if it is not pure, it is material. But the author has avowed its immateriality.

How the senses bring the mind into any thing like relation to other beings is to us perfectly unascertainable. It is just as conceivable to us that the soul should have perceptivity without the senses as with them. To use the affected definition of the author,* “Body is the tangential point of the two worlds of mind and matter.” We have always considered body to be pure matter; and yet it can be brought into contact with mind; mind can act on it, and it can act on mind. Then the important fact is established that pure mind and pure matter can bear relation to each other.

There is therefore no difficulty in the doctrine that the disembodied soul can be present with “the glorified body” of its Lord.

II. What are our author’s opinions?

“But in the second place, a relationship not at all less important than the preceding, is undoubtedly dependent upon the union of the mind with matter, or upon its corporeity;—namely, its relationship to **TIME**.

“Let the reader, by a little effort, imagine himself totally cut off from all connexion with the clock-work of the material universe;—uninformed of the alterations of day and night, and of summer and winter—remote from the swing of the pendulum, and unconscious also of the beating of the pulse, of the heaving of the chest, of the sensations of hunger and satiety, of sleep and wakefulness:—in such a state of absolute seclusion from all the mechanical and animal indices of equable motion—that is to say, knowing nothing of time, he must very soon, or as soon as the previously acquired habit of the mind had become in-

* We must not deprive our readers of a new discovery! “Body, whether animal or spiritual, is a third essence—a middle nature, and the means of the reciprocity of the two unlike substances. It is the amalgam of two substances wherein the properties of *both are so blended* as to constitute a mean, essentially unlike what could have resulted from any possible construction of the one, by itself.” What an amphibious animal is the body!

“Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
Jungere si velit, et varias inducere plumas
Undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum
Desinat in piscem mulier formosa supernè;
Spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?”

distinct, cease to be conscious of any other difference between a long period and a short one, than that which might be derived from the actual equableness of his thoughts and emotions ; and if these at some seasons (as in fact they do) followed one the other with incalculable rapidity, while at another season a single idea or emotion remained fixed in the mind, there would be no possible means of his ascertaining whether, since a certain mental state or epoch, he had existed an hour, a day, a year, a century, or a thousand years. Thus insulated from equable motion, we should not be able to correct our individual consciousness of duration by comparing it with that of others under like circumstances ; for while one, by the peculiar constitution of his mind, would tell us an eternity had elapsed since we last conferred with him, another, either more inert, or more addicted to dwell upon abstractions, would say—it was only yesterday when we compared eras. To MERE MIND, a long period means nothing else but a period in which it has passed through many and various states with a vivid consciousness and distinct recollection of each ; and a short period is one during which few ideas or emotions have sluggishly followed each other, or have intently engaged it, or, whether few or many, have clean passed from the memory. Yet the former may in fact have been only a tenth or a hundredth part of the latter. Every one's experience in dreaming, or in sickness, may furnish him with facts illustrative of the unfixedness and illusory quality of our consciousness of duration, when entirely deprived of the external means of collating our mental history with the regular motions of the material world.

“ It is motion that measures duration, and Time is duration, measured into equal parts by the equable motion of bodies through space. But as motion belongs to matter, of which it is a condition, and is that wherein duration and extension combine to form a common product, so mind must become related to extension, in order to its having any knowledge of motion, or to its being able to avail itself of the measurement of duration ; in other words, it is only in connexion with matter that it can know any thing of time.”—p. 25—27.

We again revert to Locke's definitions to observe, that “ Duration is the distance between the appearances of any two ideas in our minds.” The admeasurements of time by the revolutions of the heavenly bodies are employed because they are less fitful, more equable, than the processes of thought. But this irregularity in the velocity of thought is a consequence of the irregularity of human emotion. In a perfect or spiritual body, we may consistently expect order : there will be no languor on the one hand,—no undue precipitation on the other. Or,—which we believe to be the real fact—whereas *now* there is at all times an unbroken continuity of thought in all minds,—differing only in appearance in its velocity, in consequence of different degrees of attention to our consciousness, at different times,—which latter irregularity requires some stable epochs for its correction,—in the future world, when attention will be ever equally vigilant, such

monitors will be unnecessary. Admit for one moment that the dependence upon external movements is an imperfection,—and their inutility in a future, perfect world becomes indisputable.

III. What are our author's opinions?

“Once more, the corporeal alliance of mind and matter is, in the present state, and, as we may strongly conjecture, it will be, the means of so defining our individuality in relation to others, as to bring minds under the conditions of a social economy. The purposes of such a system demand, in the first place, what may be called the seclusion or the insulation of each spirit, or its impenetrability by other spirits. Communication and exchange of thought must, under any plan of free agency, be voluntary; there must rest with each member of the community a power of reserve; and then the means of communication being arbitrary, must be absolutely under the command of the individual. Now the body is not the open bower or tent of the soul, into which any one may walk at pleasure; but it is its castle, from which all other minds may be excluded. Perhaps unembodied spirits (if such there be) may lie open to inspection, or be liable to invasion, like an unfenced field, or a plot of common land. But although such a state of exposure might involve no harm to beings absolutely good, or absolutely evil, we cannot imagine it to consist with the safety or dignity of beings like man; or indeed to be proper to a mixed economy.

“But further; a social system demands the means of immediate recognition individually; and this, in the present state, is provided for by the endless, yet distinct peculiarities of bodily conformation, and by that law of the animal organization which gives to each peculiarity of the mind, and temper, and temperament, a characteristic exterior expression. It must not be positively affirmed that these purposes could not, in the nature of things, be secured without the aid of a corporeal structure; yet there is some reason to question whether sheer spirits could (except by immediate acts of the Divine power) be individually dealt with, and governed—could be known, and employed—could be followed and detained, could form lasting associations, and be moulded into hierarchies and politics—could sustain office, and yield obedience, in any certain manner, if at all. At least is it true that all these functions and social ends are now in fact dependent upon corporeity; and it is only fair to assume that they demand a bodily structure in every case where minds are to live and act in concert with others.”—p. 37—39.

The inevitable consequence of these premises is, that matter must prevail *universally*, wherever intelligent beings exist, or there can be no sociality between them. And why? Because, argues the author, minds unincrustated in an animal frame must be so palpable, that their very thoughts and operations must be transparent. As in the newly invented microscope the very circulation of the blood, the secretions of animalcular existence are perceptible, we presume “the thoughts and intents of the heart will be discernible in their activity.” This seems to be the author's

meaning, although in other places he would deny an unembodied mind "a local habitation or a name." And that at the very time too whilst he is contending that such palpable intelligences could not be recognized individually! Does he mean that our bodily features are the only marks of our identity? that a man is not just as cognizable by his mental peculiarities of reasoning and purpose as by the peculiarities in the lineaments of his body? Surely, this is strange reasoning.

Thus have we endeavoured to meet his leading objections to our future state of being, as immaterial for a period. We are taught to believe that the crucified malefactor was, on the night of his decease, with the Saviour in Paradise. We are informed that there is even now a community of "spirits of just men made perfect." These are Scriptural revelations, parallel with the above quoted passage, "absent from the body, present with the Lord." And it has been our object to show that the author's reasonings, to the contrary, have been inconclusive.

The entire volume is full of similarly undigested conclusions upon many other collateral topics,—but our limits will not allow us to specify them. It would be ill-judged in us to deny the writer the merit of considerable power,—but we are much mistaken, if this treatise will not materially injure his reputation. is a hot-house plant: it will be short-lived. If we have been severe, it is because from our souls we thought it deserved it. Let its author recollect that we are not now to be treated with an intellectual repast so hastily concocted as if there "was a famine in the land." If he has any manuscript which hereafter he thinks of committing to the press, we charge him with advice too long-tried to be undervalued,

"Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ."



ART. VII.—1. *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns, from various Authors, intended chiefly for Public Worship.* Second Edition. London: Low. 1836.

2. *Psalms and Hymns, selected and adapted to the purposes of Public Worship.* By the Rev. Edward Scobell, A.M. Incumbent of St. Peter's, Vere-street; and Evening Lecturer of the Parochial Church, St. Mary-le-bone. London: Bradley.

3. *Church and Home Melodies; being a New Version of the more devotional parts of the Psalms; together with a Version of the Collects, and Original Hymns for Congregational and Domes-*

tic Purposes. By the Rev. Thomas James Judkin, M.A. formerly of Caius and Gonville College, Cambridge, Minister of Somers' Chapel, St. Pancras. London : Hatchard and Son. 1834.

WE recur briefly, and almost unwillingly, to the subject of Psalms and Hymns. Our excuse must be, that every passing day impresses more forcibly upon us the need of exertion, perhaps of authoritative exertion, in order to secure uniformity and prevent disorder; while fresh examination only confirms and deepens our conviction, that not one of the collections recently published is quite worthy of the Church of England, or such as to lay a fair and strong claim to very general adoption.

At present, we take three compilations, almost at random, out of a crowd. Mr. Scobell's is new; is free, as far as we can perceive, from all objectionable matter; and is introduced by a pious and judicious preface. Yet the merits of the selection, as a whole, although it contains some pieces of real excellence and beauty, is still, we think, rather of a negative than a positive kind.

Of "*The Church and Home Melodies*," by Mr. Judkin—called at first "*The Church and Home Psalmody*,"—two distinct editions are now lying before us; the latter being a considerable enlargement of the former, and printed in a different shape. The compilation, as it appears in this later edition, consists of "*a New Version of the more Devotional Parts of the Psalms*," a versification of "the Collects for Sundays and Holidays throughout the Year," and a multitude of hymns, all written by Mr. Judkin himself, and heralded, like the Psalms, by a sonnet, which speaks of, or to, "the Congregation of Somers' Town Chapel." We subjoin it as a specimen of the reverend gentleman's muse.

"Submissive to the will of those I love,
Yea, of that little flock my heart holds dear,
(And guiding whom as pastoral overseer
May God's good grace my single aim approve!)
Submissive to their call, my fingers move
O'er Zion's harp; and if the notes they hear
Draw from its source the penitential tear,
Or wing earth-cleaving thoughts to heav'n above,
Or haply Hope's dejected brow illumine,
Or fill the eye of Faith with glad surprise,
(New stars of promise breaking forth from gloom,)
Or quicken in their flow sweet charities;
Not vain shall be the task; while meekly pays
My soul to God the tribute of its praise."

The hymns are, in their general character, precisely like this sonnet; not destitute of poetical taste and feeling, but devoid of pretensions to originality or power.

We turn then to Mr. Thomas Bagnall Baker and his collection. It is entitled "*Psalms and Hymns*;" but we find on investigation that the sweet Psalmist of Israel finds no favour in the sight of the compiler; and that the Psalms of David are dismissed for the hymns of modern Dissenters. As a selection of sacred poetry it is wretched. Mr. Baker is so ignorant of verse, that he does not know how to print it; and it occasionally takes some time to discover whether the lines are alternate or not alternate.

But the charge of very indifferent poetry is not the gravest to which this compilation is liable. Mr. Baker is assiduous to introduce very questionable theology into the hymns which are to be sung by his congregation. The following by Hart, is number 34 in his catalogue, and is headed "*Election*."

"Brethren, would you know your stay?
 What it is supports you still?
 Why, tho' tempted every day,
 Yet you stand, and *stand you will*?—
 Long before our birth,
 Nay, before Jehovah laid
 The foundations of the earth,
 We were chosen in our Head.
 God's election is the ground
 Of our hope to persevere:
 On this rock your building found,
 And preserve your title clear.
Infidels may laugh,
Pharisees gainsay or rail;
Here's your tenure (keep it safe,)
God's elect can never fail."

Heaven knows that all inclination to "*laugh*" or "*rail*" is swept away from us by the solemn nature of the subject; yet Mr. Baker may very probably stigmatize us as "*infidels and Pharisees*," if we hint a doubt concerning his favourite doctrines of irrespective election and indefeasible grace, or even concerning the propriety of bringing them prominently forward as the topics of congregational hymnody. But, alas, devotional and chastised feelings do run some risk of being lost and stifled in less sacred emotions, as we proceed to other parts of the selection of psalms and hymns "*intended chiefly for public worship*," and appointed to be used at Woburn Chapel. What must be the effect of a congregation, that is, of hundreds of persons, perhaps al-

ready excited, singing in chorus the hymn, of which the title is "*Glory, glory?*"

"I'm glad I ever saw the day,
Sing glory! glory! glory!
In which we met to sing and pray,
Sing glory! glory! glory!
'Tis glory's foretaste makes me sing
Of glory! glory! glory!
And praise my Saviour and my King,
Like those in glory! glory!
I hope to praise him when I die,
Sing glory! glory! glory!
And shout salvation as I fly
To glory! glory! glory!
I'll sing while mounting in the air
Of glory! glory! glory!
And meet my Father's children there,
In glory! glory! glory!
Come on, my friends, let's mend our pace
To glory! glory! glory!
For we shall see him face to face
In glory! glory! glory!
With Abra'm, Isaac, Jacob too,
Who dwell in glory! glory!
Let's keep the blessed prize in view,
'Tis glory! glory! glory!
A few more rising suns at most,
Sing glory! glory! glory!
And we shall join the ransom'd host
In glory! glory! glory!
Upon mount Sion we shall meet
In glory! glory! glory!
And cast our crowns beneath his feet:
Sing glory! glory! glory!
Come sinners, come along with us
To glory! glory! glory!
There's room enough in that blest house
Where Jesus dwells in glory!
Believe, repent, seek holiness,
And glory! glory! glory!
For God doth freely give us grace
And glory! glory! glory!"

We turned with some curiosity to the index, that we might discover to whom the world is indebted for this enthusiastic effusion. But as it is marked "*Anon.*" we beg leave to congratulate the author or authoress in having at least had the discretion

to conceal his or her name. We say his or her, because Mr. Baker reckons among his contributors one lady, if not more, namely, Mrs. Steele, who has favoured the collection with hymn 60, beginning

“ Dear refuge of my weary soul,
On thee, when sorrows rise,
On thee when waves of trouble roll,
My fainting hope relies.
To thee I tell each rising grief,
For thou alone canst heal :
Thy word can bring a sweet relief,
For every pain I feel.”

In a similar strain is hymn 27, styled “ *Union at Parting*,” The admonitions of Bishop Heber ring in our ears, as we sub-join the opening stanza.

“ Blest be the dear uniting love
That will not let us part ;
Our bodies may far off remove,
We still are one in heart.”

They who like to see the familiar language of affection, not to say passion, transferred from human objects to divine, and applied to that Being who is God as well as man—they who can deem this almost amatory style of speech a fit model for congregational singing—will also think it right and proper that the Psalms of David should be excluded to make room for such delectable strains as the succeeding, halt and hobble as they may.

“ Begone unbelief, my Saviour is near,
And for my relief will surely appear ;
By prayer let me wrestle, and he will perform ;
With Christ in the vessel, I smile at the storm.
Though dark be my way, since he is my guide,
'Tis mine to obey, 'tis his to provide ;
Though cisterns be broken, and creatures all fail,
The word he has spoken shall surely prevail.
His love in time past forbids me to think,
He'll leave me at last in trouble to sink ;
Each sweet Ebenezer I have in review,
Confirms his good pleasure to help me quite through.”

The term “ *Ebenezer*” used in this strange manner, seems to be an especial favourite with Mr. Baker. Thus

“ He who has help'd me hitherto,
Will help me all my journey through,
And give me daily cause to raise
New Ebenezers to his praise.”

Again—

“Come, thou fount of every blessing,
Tune my heart to sing thy grace;
Streams of mercy never ceasing,
Call for songs of loudest praise.

Teach me some melodious sonnet
Sung by flaming tongues above,
Praise the mount—O fix me on it,
Mount of God’s unchanging love.

Here I raise my Ebenezer;
Hither by thy help I’m come,
And I trust through thy good pleasure
Safely to arrive at home.”

But enough of Mr. Baker’s hymns, which have the peculiar felicity of oftentimes departing quite as much from rhyme as from reason. Yet this precious collection, as we see by the title-page, has arrived at a second edition. And what wonder? *Quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens*,—nay, whether struck with admiration at the verses, or not struck with admiration,—the frequenters of Woburn Chapel must either buy them, or be without psalmody? For there is, or was, a printed advertisement on the door, giving the very significant hint, that the hymn-book used at this chapel, and printed for its use, was to be had of the “*vestry-woman*,” or of certain booksellers, duly specified, and living in the neighbourhood.

This is a disagreeable point of view, and yet it is one in which the matter must be considered. Alas! we know not how soon the alterations in the Church may compel many of her ministers to eke out a difficult subsistence by questionable means, which may compromise the proper dignity of the order, and somewhat trench upon their own self-respect. In the meantime we would declare—and even our respect and regard, which are very great, for such men as Mr. Scobell, must not prevent us from declaring,—that the compilation and sale of hymn-books for the use of their respective churches and chapels is hardly a legitimate source of profit to clergymen of the Establishment, and hardly a fair tax to be levied upon their congregations. We say a tax, because in other cases a man is under no obligation to buy a work, unless he *wishes* to buy it; but here he has scarcely the same liberty of purchasing or declining to purchase. He may not like to stand up at church in the sight of his minister without having the collection of the said minister in his hand; or, if he is without it, he may be of necessity prevented from taking his share in one portion of the public worship. We are quite aware that the consideration of personal gain has never for a moment

entered the minds of several excellent men, as Mr. Scobell, for instance, who have either undertaken or contemplated this kind of authorship. We are perfectly convinced that they would much rather print at a sacrifice than at a profit; but they ought to be removed even from the suspicion. There may be others, too, who are not so scrupulous; there may be others who do make a gain, and almost a little annuity, out of the hymn-books which they compile. First, a volume may be published, and sold, perhaps in the vestry, at the price of three or four shillings; and then, in the course of two or three years, may come out under the same auspices, at the same, or a higher price, another and a different volume, which supersedes the first, or at least renders it comparatively useless; or, in fact, a revised compilation, with considerable emendations and additions, may be continually supplied at such intervals as are expedient or practicable. But is not this system, we ask—and, if the custom continues, our hypothetical case will be soon realised—is not this system something like a hardship and an impost upon a whole congregation, and especially upon its poorer members?

But we must return to Mr. Baker, though, as we rejoice to say, not to his hymns. There were lately other intimations affixed to the door of this Episcopal chapel, as one, for instance, about a *week-night's* lecture; an intimation of so proper and useful a thing, that it ought to be given in ordinary and less affected language. It was also mentioned that the "*vaults were to be let, inquire at the chapel;*" and close beside the former announcement was a printed notice, which ran literally as follows:—"The Committee of the Young Mens' Society for the Protection of Public Morals, have pleasure in announcing, that in pursuance of their resolution that one or more sermons shall be preached on every Sabbath evening in the metropolis to young men, the Rev. T. B. Baker will preach in Woburn Chapel, Tavistock-place, on the next Lord's day evening, August 28. Subject, "*The claims of society on young men.*"

Here, be it observed, our complaint is not so much of the thing itself as of the manner in which the thing is done. "*The claims of society on young men*" may be a very fit theme for a discourse from the pulpit; and, if a certain number of young men choose to constitute among themselves *a society for the protection of public morals*, we shall make no attempt to throw derision upon their undertaking: we shall neither provoke nor indulge a smile. But it does seem to us, we confess, a strange, and questionable, and somewhat anomalous proceeding, that this young mens' society, or the committee of this young mens' society, are to *pass resolutions* what sermons shall be preached, at least in churches

and chapels belonging to the Establishment, and, as it appears, to fix the subject: it does seem to us still more extraordinary that a sermon on the given subject is actually to be preached, and a preliminary notification to that effect affixed to the chapel door *in pursuance of such resolutions*, and clearly under the auspices of such Society. The Clergy, we had imagined, were, at least in their own pulpits, to be the guides and directors, not the mere instruments and mouth-pieces of other persons, whether young or old. Yet we have observed similar notifications and similar compliances in the case of other associations and other clergymen; so that, in course of time, the pulpit may be at the command of this or that society, and the sermons at their dictation. But what is this but just a part of that system, through which Episcopacy is dishonoured, and ancient order bleeds at every pore? Soon, too, there may be a kind of tacit reciprocation between the contracting parties; and the Societies will be virtually pledged to assist particular churches and chapels, as these churches and chapels serve the purposes of these particular Societies. Sure we are, that, if practices are encouraged, such as those which call forth our present animadversions, a rapid deterioration will take place both in the habits of the clergy and the reverent estimation with which they are regarded. God forbid that the ministers of the Church of England should be proud in their deportment; that they should hold themselves aloof from the people committed to their care, with a Pharisaical and supercilious, with a harsh and haughty carriage. But let not the difference be overlooked between exhibiting a personal arrogance, and upholding the importance of their order and the superior authority of its functions. If clergymen can think it worth their while to court a fleeting popularity by irregular and undignified expedients; if they can deem it right to pursue a system of, as it were, advertising for an audience; they may see their chapels filled for a time with an excited congregation, and there may be a vast appearance of immediate piety; but the eventual issue will be, not the less, a lamentable falling off in true religion and godly discipline.

Mr. Baker, we have been given to understand, is one of those gentlemen who are apt to bring the charge of want of fidelity to the Gospel against all clergymen who cannot acquiesce in the peculiar interpretation of themselves and their coterie. This tendency is apparent throughout a funeral sermon which has been lately published, as witness the following passage, which we now extract from "The Pulpit," but which, we believe, has also been quoted in other places with vast applause.

"Before I enter on the interpretation of this scripture, I would just

remark, beloved, that it is my determination, as heretofore, when I have appeared amongst the inhabitants of this parish, *to preach unto you a faithful gospel sermon.* I am emboldened to do this in consequence of what perhaps I might say was a requisition from him, around whose remains you are at present assembled. I remember on a certain occasion coming home with him, and while we sat at his table we entered into a conversation respecting what may be called funeral sermons; and in his peculiar phraseology he addressed me in this language:—‘My child,’ said he, “if ever it should please God that either you or any one of my Christian brethren should be called upon to preach a sermon after my death, take care,” said he, ‘that you preach **JESUS CHRIST** and not **JOHN SIMONS.**’ ”

At much of Mr. Baker’s preaching, if we may judge from this specimen, just exceptions might be taken, not only as to particular expressions, but as to the general tone.—The *week-night* lecture, too, and the *Lord’s day*. What are we to say of this assumption of superior godliness, this double-distilled and extra-gilt piety, this implied reproof of all others, who refuse to mark themselves off from their brethren by the use of a peculiar phraseology, but continue to speak the common language of a Christian country? Nay, there is a virtual censure of men, who ought to be free and even sacred from the very shadow of reproach. The compilers of our Liturgy thought it no blasphemy that the Prayer-Book should contain such terms as *Easter Sunday*, *Whit-Sunday*, and the *Sundays* after *Trinity*. Does Mr. Baker give out the Sacrament in his *Episcopal* chapel for the *Lord’s day next*, and talk of *Whit Lord’s day* and *Easter Lord’s day*? Then Cranmer, we suppose, and his illustrious colleagues, were persons quite destitute of true devotion and spirituality of mind when put by the side of this ultra-scrupulous gentleman, who lets his vaults and sells his hymn-books. Be it remembered, that it is not the use of the expression *Lord’s day* or *Sabbath* that we deprecate, for either of them is most right and proper in itself, but the fantastical yet rigorous prohibition of the word “*Sunday.*” And why do we deprecate it? Because this prohibition or interdict is made the symbol of a particular school of religious exclusives. It can serve no other purpose. For if “*Sunday*” is a forbidden and unmentionable term, if a decided Christian cannot allow so heathenish a vocable to pass his lips, and yet he goes no farther in his excisions or substitutions, he is guilty either of gross inconsistency or of sheer ignorance. A very slight acquaintance with the etymology and original signification of words would inform him, that many of the phrases which now pass as harmless and unexceptionable, ought, upon his principles, to stick most chokingly in his throat. And thus a man’s vocabulary would be sadly curtailed; loquacity would be turned almost

into dumbness; and Mr. Thomas Bagnall-Baker would find himself somewhat puzzled when he next mounted his pulpit to preach an extempore sermon, if indeed the word "sermon" itself could be permitted in the mouth of a purist and precisian of so strict a nicety of speech.

Of Mr. Baker, of his connections, of his habits, of his personal character, we know positively nothing. He may be thoroughly sincere in his opinions, and thoroughly estimable as an individual in all the relations of private life. But he has taken especial pains to put himself before the public in the capacity of a minister of the Church of England. In that capacity we would address him; and if he should accuse our observations of harshness or injustice, we would answer that we wrong him not, but that he has wronged himself. We would tell him for his own sake, we would tell him for the sake of that Church, we would tell him for the sake of genuine and reasonable Christianity, that there is scarcely any one spectacle which so afflicts a well-regulated mind, or which affords so measureless a triumph to the infidel and the scorner as what they call a transparent and thrice-wretched quackery, a sanctimonious affectation of unworldly and super-worldly holiness, mingled with an evident desire of earthly emolument. When men turn their piety to account by drawing largely upon the purses of their congregation, or by rendering it a stepping-stone to any settled pecuniary advantage, the common sneer is inevitably repeated, that "*they are sure to make it pay.*"

It is, therefore, a sad and pitiable thing to see the doors of an Episcopal chapel stuck over, almost as if with play-bills, with notices intimating where the minister's hymn-book is to be sold, and what particular exhibition he intends to make in conformity with the request of "*The Young Mens' Society for the Protection of Public Morals.*" And have the parties who possess superior authority in or over the parish no power to arrest proceedings which they can hardly fail to lament? or has Mr. Baker the unrestricted right to puff himself, and his preachings, and his selections of psalms and hymns, by the printed announcements on his chapel door?

These remarks will be unpalatable; and it is as much a discomfort to us that we must write them, as it can be to others that they are the subjects of them. But the inconvenience is one which we must be content to bear. They who undertake the task of theological and clerical criticism must oftentimes undergo a painful struggle between their disinclination to wound the feelings of individuals, and their wish to maintain the true interests of the Church. We live, moreover, in times when some men, pure in their intentions, and worthy of all respect for their personal behaviour, can yet bring themselves to such a pitch of carelessness

about the preservation of ecclesiastical discipline and regularity, as in effect to become almost enemies to the Establishment in which they minister. They can talk of it perhaps loudly and earnestly as an integral part of the constitution of the empire, at once an ally and safeguard of the state; and yet they can disregard its essential peculiarities and its distinguishing excellences as an Apostolical Church.

Of none of these persons have we spoken in terms of sarcastic and injurious *ridicule*, unless they have first ventured upon the dangerous amusement of flinging stones at their brethren, and either from the pulpit or the press publicly reprobating the majority of the clergy as unfaithful shepherds and stewards who betray their trust. This is no light offence; and they who treat it lightly cannot be much in earnest as to their ecclesiastical principles; and they who commit it ought to be thankful, if they receive no weightier measure of castigation than a few tokens of honest and irrepressible disgust.

Of others, however, it is true, we have sometimes declared our opinion in a light rather than a serious tone. But why? Partly because their absurdities have been so preposterously grotesque,

“That to be grave exceeds all power of face;”

partly because we must deal with them according to the importance which they possess in the eyes of the world, and not according to the awful degree of consequence which they may attach to themselves and their lucubrations; partly too for their own good; because we should be glad, if we could in time laugh them out of a course, of which the ultimate result, should they persist in it, may be no subject for laughter; because we heartily desire that a little pleasantry, albeit at their expense, may prevent the necessity of far more pointed censure and far more indignant rebuke. Still perhaps they will continue to be dissatisfied. But in that case it will be impossible for us to please them, until we can bring our expressions to praise the very proceedings which our consciences must condemn.

ART. IX.—*The Roman Schism illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church.* By the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B. C. L. London: Leslie. 1836. pp. li.—463.

IN contemplating the various controversies between Romanists and their opponents during the last century, it appears that little progress has been made on either side in developing new arguments or settling old disputes. The unvaried round of the same

objections and replies which characterized our controversies in the days of the Stuart dynasty, has been destined to keep possession, and to reappear whenever a sufficient stimulus has been given. There is, after all, something not very creditable in this, and we should hail with satisfaction the day when our arguments with Romanists assumed more of the character of a contest of living minds acting on the materials of thought, learning, and ingenuity supplied by former ages, and deducing from them new and solid methods of defending the truth. For a long time indeed the Romish controversy attracted little attention. The revolution and subsequent events had broken down their political power, and overthrown those ambitious hopes and systems of politico-religious combinations so unhappily connected with their name in our national history. And this, united with their comparative moderation, their greater openness to conviction, the more liberal sentiments which occasionally appeared among them, the very divisions which existed in this country between the Cisalpine and Ultramontane parties, all tended to render this controversy of moderate importance, and to withdraw from it the attention of those whose genius or learning might have thrown new light upon it. The very same causes which induced us to forget Romanism, reduced Romanists themselves to comparative silence; and when the controversy revived with their claims for political power, each party stood nearly in the same position as it had occupied a hundred years before; though it must be admitted that our opponents had, in the interval, been most diligent in the completion of their system where it was deficient, in the accumulation of materials for immediate use, and in disciplining their priesthood. Every thing which the master-mind of Bossuet, the learning of Arnauld, the ingenuity of Veron, and the craft of the Wallemboroughs had supplied, was condensed and freed from all extraneous matter: the stores of argument collected by Bellarmine, Vasquez, and a thousand other able theologians, were subjected to a discriminating investigation: and all that was adapted to the notions, and the wants of modern times, was brought within a narrow compass, and assiduously taught to the candidates for their priesthood. This system is certainly not devoid of practical wisdom, but the arguments employed are, in every important point, those of the seventeenth century.

The implicit confidence which our opponents repose in their theologians of that age, is at least rivalled by that with which we regard the learned labours of Stillingfleet, Barrow, and our other writers of the same period, and we seem persuaded that these great men have left nothing to their successors except to follow implicitly in the lines they have marked out. Yet we have not

fully availed ourselves of their labours : we have not, like our adversaries, condensed their arguments, supplied their deficiencies, corrected their mistakes, and given to the students in our schools of divinity the essence of all their wisdom. This would be no easy task ; but it would be a very useful one. We are at present deficient in works adapted for the especial communication of such knowledge to students. It has often been observed and regretted, that many of our writers have entered on the discussion of these important controversies, rather to meet some immediate exigency than to provide permanent instruction for the Church. It is to be regretted, because compositions hastily called for exact, in prudence, or in conscience, unless from men of extraordinary attainments, a too implicit adherence to existing modes of controversy, and have a tendency to induce an indiscriminate adoption of whatever appears calculated to attain the object immediately in view, without regard to consistency or caution ; and hence it tends to the introduction of extreme and untenable views. And more especially, controversy with individuals, where the ground is selected by an adversary perhaps of inferior capacity, and where we have to pursue him through the mazes of intricate and inconsequential reasonings, disclose his ignorance and dishonesty, and treat all subjects in the order which he has marked out, does appear little calculated for the permanent instruction of the Church. It is tedious to observe voluminous refutations of arguments which do not merit to be refuted, or which, at all events, are no longer employed ; and, perhaps, the very abundance of learning and of argument may sometimes be itself no inconsiderable evil.

But the truth is, that our deficiency in works of a systematic character adapted for theological instructions, arises from the peculiar circumstances in which the Church has been placed. There has been no regular demand for works of this kind, because theology itself has not been taught systematically. Amidst the fall of the scholastic theology, and the revival of Scriptural and Patristic studies, the mode of instruction varied most materially, and ultimately individuals were left nearly unaided to exercise their abilities in researches for the confirmation of the creed which they professed, and for the acquisition of the knowledge requisite for the sacred office of the ministry. Without doubt this system, so widely different from that pursued in almost every other Church, has advantages of its own ; and the splendid results which have emanated from the learning and labours of our great theologians, have probably persuaded many that our present system is exactly what it ought to be. It is certainly peculiar to ourselves, and is more adapted to the production of bold and liberal inquiry, than to promote uniformity or sobriety of opinion. However, the

want of uniform and regular instruction withdraws from writers the direct inducement to prepare works destined for such uses.

Nor is it merely the want of system which we have to regret in many respectable writers on this controversy: there is not unfrequently a deficiency of information on the nature of Romanism. This indeed cannot be attributed to our elder and more learned divines. The Usshers, Fields, Hammonds, Barrows, Stillingfleets, Beveridges, Bulls, were men who had examined the question on both sides, and spoke generally with a perfect knowledge of the strength of their adversary's cause as it stood in that age. We cannot extend this praise to later writers, whose knowledge of the Romish system has been chiefly limited to that which they derived at second hand from their great predecessors. And yet the general system of Romanism merits on all accounts an attentive examination from those who have time and abilities to trace it thoroughly to its principles. The analysis will disclose an almost infinite diversity of opinion of which the world knows nothing, and which is concealed under an exterior of uniformity; variations of the highest importance, amounting in fact to different religions; and ultimate principles, which, if followed out, would lead the Romanist from his difficulties and errors into communion of spirit and sentiment with all the children of the Catholic Church. From inquiries into the real principles of their own system, and inquiries not fettered by the dictates of the schools or of the Romish theologians of the seventeenth century, we should anticipate results salutary beyond measure to Romanists themselves and to Christianity in general. We are convinced that the principles of that system are misrepresented and misunderstood by its own adherents, and that, when thoroughly investigated, they would be found very different from the notions commonly connected with the name of infallibility.

But alas! when may we hope to see this inquiry instituted amongst Romanists themselves? When (at least in these countries) can we expect to see among them men who shall have at once the candour, the learning, the ability, the prudence, and the courage requisite to the formation of an improved system of theology as much advanced beyond that of Bossuet and Veron, as theirs surpassed the system of former times? All that ingenuity could accomplish in the way of explanation and distinction was accomplished at that time. Obnoxious tenets were refined away, or, to speak more truly and charitably, ancient truths which had been latterly rejected as heretical, were revived and took their place in the minds of Romanists again, at least as recognized and probable opinions. These explanations indeed were apparently designed for controversial purposes:—they were the cutting away

of things which hung as a weight around them, impeding the defence of their cause; but they acted differently (through the Divine blessing), tending toward the real restoration of some neglected truths, and the real removal of some common errors. They created different schools, nay, different religions among the Romanists, for the contrast is so strong between the opinions and general tone of various parties, that it amounts to this. From the most degraded errors and superstitions and the grossest idolatry, up to the very height of spiritual devotion, and the very verge of truth, or even to the truth itself, though veiled in a different phraseology, Romanism contains all that can be imagined of variation in doctrine and in practice. And hence arises the peculiar difficulty of this controversy, because the views entertained on the matters in debate are really often so various in the Romish communion, that it is next to impossible to fix a dexterous opponent to the defence of those obnoxious tenets which can decidedly be refuted, and which are indeed held *in* that communion, but not universally. This circumstance, however, which has so often enabled them to baffle their opponents and elude the combat except on ground of their own selection, when perhaps they have entrapped an eager antagonist into the defence of some utterly untenable position, may yet be made to lend essential aid to the cause of truth, and (we may add) to that of peace, by convincing Romanists, that the principles, the arguments, the opinions of their principal theologians are opposed to the errors which we combat, and confirmatory of the truths and rights which we maintain. It may be adduced in refutation of their claim to a permanent infallible tribunal for the decision of all controversies, and to a perfect unity and certainty in all matters of religion. We would apply this observation even to the decrees of councils and the authoritative formularies of the Romish church. It appears to us that in many instances the interpretation commonly affixed to these decrees by Romanists in later times, was not originally received as a matter of certainty. In many instances authorities of this kind are adduced against us which are disputed by Romanists themselves. It seems indeed that our writers have frequently not exercised sufficient vigilance over the conduct of our opponents in this respect, who are thus permitted to avail themselves of authorities to which they have no certain right, and to place themselves in a position which ought to have been occupied at least equally by ourselves. For example, the decree of the Lateran synod; which is generally claimed and admitted as having established the doctrine of transubstantiation, might without difficulty be shown to prove no such thing. It has, in fact, been proved, that notwithstanding this decree, a great variety of opinion on the

subject existed long afterwards in the Western Church,* and that, while the term of transubstantiation was often used, it was not always in the sense which Romanists connect with it. A sagacious theologian will always endeavour to place his own cause in the most favourable position, so as to excite the least prejudice against it; and hence appears the utility of a thorough knowledge of the Romish theology, in depriving them of that vantage-ground of authority to which they pretend. This, we are persuaded, is a far safer and more effectual course than that of some writers, whose pleasure it is to place themselves in opposition to the authority of the church in general, and to invest the decrees which Romanists claim as favourable to them, with as much as possible of ecclesiastical authority and of evil meaning.

The valuable work of Mr. Perceval on "*The Roman Schism*," will prove eminently useful in this respect, comprising as it does all the decrees of general councils which are brought into controversy between us and Romanists, together with observations and remarks well calculated to place the question of authority on its right grounds. The general object of this work is stated in the following manner: "One of the great difficulties with which the clergy of the Church of England have to contend in the controversy with Rome, now re-opened, consists in the scarcity and costliness of the works from which alone accurate knowledge of the Roman doctrines is to be obtained. With a view to remedy this evil in part, there are presented to the reader in the following collection, extracted from all the councils authoritatively received in the Church of Rome, all the decrees upon the points in dispute between it and the Church of England; thus enabling the student upon this subject to substitute a small octavo volume for sixteen or seventeen folios. That the work may be as useful to others besides the clergy, the decrees have been given in English, but the originals have been subjoined, that there might be no room to question the (at least intentional) accuracy of the translation." These extracts from the councils of the edition of Labbé and Cossart form the basis of the work. A general introduction is prefixed, containing much matter concerning the relative position of the Churches of England and Rome, which deserves serious attention, and which we shall advert to hereafter; and the decrees of the councils are followed by annotations, in which considerable erudition and an acute intellect are every where to be recognized. A valuable Appendix concludes the work, in which the doctrines of the primitive Fathers on image-worship, the

* By Dr. Field, *Of the Church*, Appendix to Book III. See also Mr. Perceval's volume, p. 346.

canon of Scripture, transubstantiation, half-communion, &c., are adduced in direct opposition to the rash decrees of the late councils called General. The decrees and canons of councils are divided into two parts: the first comprising those which were held before A.D. 700; and the second, commencing with the deuter-Nicene Synod, A.D. 787; and terminating with that of Trent, which is very properly given at great length, extending to 186 pages. To each of these parts an introduction is prefixed, containing very useful observations on the history and authority of the councils comprised under it. The decrees and canons then follow in chronological order, and a title at the head of each explains its general bearing on the controversy. We shall notice first some of Mr. Perceval's general views and arguments, and afterwards make such remarks on the details of his work as may seem necessary.

Mr. Perceval very judiciously does not enter on any discussion of the abstract question of the authority of really œcumenical councils. Such a discussion, if creditably and safely conducted, must have occupied too large a space, and might have given rise to difference of opinion, which would perhaps render his present work less generally acceptable than we trust it will prove. He appeals to the decrees of councils acknowledged by Romanists to be infallible, as affording the only decisive proof of what the genuine doctrines of the Church of Rome are, for, as he observes,

“As long as the bishops of the Roman communion will persist in ascribing to the deuter-Nicene Council, and those subsequent to it, the character and authority of general councils, (in which, according to their theory, it is the Holy Spirit that infallibly guides the decisions,) so long it is impossible that they can release themselves from the snare in which they are taken. They, and the churches under them, must needs receive the decrees of those councils, however novel, monstrous and self-contradictory, with the same feelings of implicit reverence with which the rest of the Catholic Church are taught to receive the deep things contained in the books of the sacred Scriptures.”

The most reasonable hope we can entertain of the ultimate conversion of Romanists generally, is founded on the existence of principles among them, which in their proper application may unloose the bonds of imaginary authority which impose certain errors and superstitions upon them. They acknowledge that a council which cannot be proved to be really general is not obligatory; and there are various arguments by which it may be plainly evidenced that many of the councils which they acknowledge as such were not truly general. Mr. Perceval, in several parts of his work, lays down a principle which they will admit, namely, that “*no council is to be accounted general or universal whose decrees are not generally or universally received by the*

Catholic Church.”—p. 17—21. And on this principle he thus argues against the Romish councils.

“They will themselves, for the most part, acknowledge that that which rests on the authority of the Pope alone ought not to be required of any man as necessary to salvation; yet on what but the authority of the Pope alone does the claim of the Synod at Trent rest to the character of a general-council? Neither the number of bishops there assembled, nor of the countries which they represented, nor of the countries which received the decrees there passed, could furnish a pretext for such a claim; and the same remark may be made of all the pseudo-general synods up to the deutero-Nicene inclusive. They have not the essential marks of general councils, and, therefore, even according to the Roman theory, their decrees are not of necessity binding upon any Christian bishop.

“If the grounds for rejecting the authority of the deutero-Nicene Council and those subsequent to it be more particularly inquired after, the reader will find below, that in respect of the deutero-Nicene Council of so little authority was it esteemed, that the churches of Lombardy, Germany, Gaul and Britain, did not hesitate to reject and condemn its decrees, nor did any interruption of communion thereupon ensue between the churches which rejected these decrees and the Church of Rome which received them. Nor did Pope Adrian, who befriended the council, venture, in his controversy with Charlemagne respecting it, to urge its authority as a bar to gainsaying. It was not counted by Pope Nicholas, nearly one hundred years afterwards, among the general councils, nor was it inserted at first in the *Liber Diurnus*; and so late as the sixteenth century so little did the members of the Church of Rome consider themselves bound to respect it, that Jacobus Merlin, who published a collection of the general councils at Paris in 1523, at Cologne, 1530, and again at Paris, 1535, excludes it from his list. As regards what they call the eighth general council, namely, that of Constantinople, 869, it was never received in the East, there being another council at the same place, 879, to which they ascribed that title; nay, some reserved it for the Council of Florence, where a temporary re-union was patched up between Rome and Constantinople. It was likewise excluded from Jacobus Merlin's collection. At the four Lateran councils it is not pretended that the Greek Church was represented, they were never received in the East; only one was mentioned at Constance and Basle, but which of the four is not specified, and they were all excluded from the collection of Jacobus Merlin. Of the fourth of these, which is the most important of them, it is further to be observed, that according to Platina, Nauclerus and Matthew Paris, there were no canons passed at it. It appears that some were read to the council by Pope Innocent, but not passed. Those which go under the name of the fourth Lateran were first given to the world with that designation in 1538 by Johannes Cochläus. To the two councils of Lyons and that of Vienne the same objection holds, that there were no representatives of the Eastern Churches there, except a few compulsory delegates of the Greek Emperor at the second of Lyons; nor were their decrees

received in the East, except those of the second of Lyons, compulsorily and uncanonically for the short space of eight years; small store is set upon them by the Romans themselves, and they were all excluded from the collection of Jacobus Merlin. To the councils of Constance and Basle the same objection applies, that the Eastern Churches had no voice in those assemblies, nor ever received their decrees; to which the higher objection (in a Roman's estimation) must be added, that they were hardly recognized by the bishops of Rome, and almost all their decrees rejected by them. At the Council of Florence there were indeed some Grecian representatives, and an agreement was patched up for the moment. But the agreement was obtained by fraud and bribery, and indignantly and contemptuously rejected by the Great Synod at Constantinople. The little conclave of one hundred and fourteen, called the fifth Lateran, is not received by large portions of the Roman communion. And as for the cabal at Trent, which, from the paucity of its numbers, and the narrow limits from which they came, did not venture to speak of itself as representing the Catholic Church, enough has been already said."—pp. xiii.—xvi.

We must refer the reader to Mr. Perceval's work for further details on this important subject, in the very useful notices which are prefixed to the decrees of the councils. But we now turn to his views on the relative position of the British and Romish Churches. The position which he invariably assigns to our's as an independent Apostolical Church, a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, possessed of the exalted rights and privileges which have descended to us from the Apostles, with the succession of the sacred ministry, is at once consistent with the truth, and productive of consequences most beneficial to our cause. The position in which it places us is this, that we are not bound to prove Romanists guilty of heresy and apostacy in order to justify the very existence of our Church; that whatever be their doctrines and practice, we cannot be bound to enter their communion; and that, on the contrary, they are bound to unite themselves to our Church, and are guilty of schism in refusing to do so. That the Romanists in England and Ireland are mere schismatics, and do not constitute a church of Christ, was maintained long ago by Barrow in his treatise on the Unity of the Church. But Mr. Perceval's view is supported by a still higher authority, the canons of the Church of England in 1603. "Whosoever," they say, "shall hereafter affirm or maintain that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies or congregations of the king's born subjects than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated." We cannot but regard this, after all, as the only safe and consistent position for the Church to assume. If

she did not claim the spiritual allegiance of the people to the exclusion and rejection of *all rival claims*, the reasons on which the duty of communion with her are founded must be derived from no absolute *religious* obligation; but from some expedencies or fitnesses of merely human invention, and which must be subject to all the variations of individual tastes and intellects. We should say, indeed, that the Church has no right to invite converts to enter her communion, or to urge her own members to remain within her pale, unless she is able to maintain that there is a clear and solemn religious obligation to do so. The Church was founded as a visible society by Christ himself, and the obligation to be of that visible society is derived from Christ's institution. It is not a matter of expediency, but of necessity to be so; and any society which cannot assert its claims on that foundation, carries on its face the marks of a merely human fabrication, which has neither lot nor part in the kingdom of Christ. These views may be unsuited to modern tastes and tendencies, but they are not the less true; and it is clear that the exigencies of the times will render it continually more and more necessary in members of our Apostolical Church to defend and propagate just and adequate notions of her spiritual authority.

The charge of *schism* is very justly made against the Romanists of these countries, in consequence of their acting in direct opposition to the ancient canons which establish the liberties and authority of particular churches like ours, and denounce severe penalties against all, who, like the Romanists, "separate themselves from the Church, and made congregations contrary to our canonical bishops." Such persons are even regarded as heretics by the second general council. (See pp. xxxi. 31.) "The position of these Roman bishops in the British dioceses is the more inexcusable, because they can trace no descent, nor do they pretend to be descended from the ancient churches in these islands. . . . The orthodox, or, as they are commonly called, the Protestant bishops of the three kingdoms, (with those who have proceeded from them in North America,) are the only representatives by Episcopal succession of the bishops of the Celtic and Anglo-Saxon Churches. The bishops in adherence to the Roman Pontiff who have entered into our dioceses are of foreign stock, and have derived their orders since the Reformation from Spain and Italy."—p. xxxiii. The Romish Church *generally* is regarded as schismatical in exacting as terms of communion and articles of faith doctrines which are of uncertain authority. Any body of Christians which refuses to communicate with the rest of the faithful, solely because they will not confess their belief in actual errors, or in uncertainties, must certainly be re-

garded as actuated by a spirit opposed to genuine Christian charity, and so far cuts itself off from the unity of the Church. But the imputation of schism even in this case rests properly on the *instigators* of such measures, on those whose station and knowledge rendered them responsible for the conduct of others, and not on those who have been misled by false instructions and an erring authority. There is much in Mr. Perceval's remarks on this subject (pp. xxiii.—xxx.), in which we most fully concur, though on one or two points of minor importance we may not perhaps see our way so clearly. For instance, we are not prepared to say that it would be unlawful or inconsistent with the principles of Christian unity to require a denial of some Romish errors from converts to our Church. If errors of a very serious character are current among them, whether authorized by their councils or not, it would seem not to be inconsistent with Christian charity to obtain some security that such errors shall not be introduced into our communion also, and that the peace of our own churches shall not be disturbed. But without doubt Mr. Perceval's observations are directed against the establishment of any such formularies as might require converts from Romanism to reject the doctrines of their Church as decidedly *contrary* to the Catholic faith and heretical. This alone would afford a case strictly parallel to that of the Romish Church's conduct towards us; and it would be unjustifiable to exact the condemnation of certain opinions as heresies which are merely improbable or erroneous.

The controversies on the subject of tradition between us and Romanists, afford an exemplification of what we have observed above as to the variations of our opponents, and the difficulty of fixing them in an untenable position. The decree of the Synod of Trent, on the subject of Scripture and tradition, declares that the Gospel is contained in Scripture and unwritten tradition, and therefore,—

“Omnes libros tam veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continuâ successione in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.”—(*Perceval*, pp. 159, 160.)

Now, as far as this decree itself goes, we are not bound to object to the Romish doctrine of tradition. Even Chillingworth himself expresses his perfect willingness to submit to the weight of a tradition preserved by “a perpetual succession in the Catholic Church,” or, as his adversary Knott defined it, “such a tradition which involves an evidence of fact, and from hand to hand, from age to age, bringing us up to the times and persons

of the Apostles and our Saviour himself, cometh to be confirmed by all those miracles and other arguments whereby they convinced their doctrine to be true." His observation in reply to this is,—“ Prove the canon of Scripture which you receive by such tradition, and we will allow it. Prove your whole doctrine, or the infallibility of your Church by such tradition, and we will yield to you in all things.” Archbishop Cranmer had no less reverence for truly Catholic tradition. In his speech on general councils he said, “ that when all the Fathers agreed in the exposition of any place of Scripture, he acknowledged he looked on that as flowing from the spirit of God; and it was a most dangerous thing to be wise in our own conceit.” We recognize unreservedly the weight and authority of tradition in this sense: not as conveying to us doctrines of the faith which are not also contained in Holy Scripture, but as affording an independent testimony to Scriptural truths, and enabling us by its application to discriminate heretical interpretations of Scripture from the truth. Of the value and blessing of tradition in this sense we are deeply persuaded; and no Romanist can surpass the true sons of the Church of England in veneration for the instruction of the truly Universal Church, not limited to the present age, nor to a few nations, but in its true greatness comprising the voice of all ages and countries from the present time to the time of the Apostles. Such would seem to be also the meaning of the decree of the Synod of Trent on this subject. That decree only receives traditions which have descended by “*continual succession*” in the “*Catholic Church*,” and it does not affirm that any such traditions are not *also* conveyed in Scripture. They may be essentially identical with Scripture itself; and accordingly the learned and candid Cassander described the Scripture as tradition folded up and sealed, and tradition as Scripture explained and opened. The one is in fact the other in a different form. And however little we might imagine it, the very same notion of tradition has been held or admitted by Romanists of eminence. For instance, White in his Apology for Tradition observes, that “ it is not the Catholic position that *all its doctrines are not contained in Scripture*;” and Bailly, a theologian of much authority in the Romish schools even at present, admits that “*ne minimum quidem tradi debet sine Scripturis* quarum interpretatio ad Ecclesiam pertinet . . . verum est quidem *totam fidem Christianam* ex Scripturarum divinarum demonstratione vim habere, seu Scripturas esse fundamentum fidei nostræ, sive quia fidei dogmata Scripturis probantur, sive quia ipsa autoritas Ecclesiæ traditionumque necessitas ac veritas Scripturis fundantur. Hinc S. Doctor (Cyrillus Hierosol.) scribit nullam veritatem esse accipiendam nisi ex Scrip-

turis demonstratur; sed ibi sermo est de Scripturis, ad sensum Ecclesiæ, quæ fidus est sacrorum codicum interpres, intellectis." The objection to the sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith, is, in short, only an objection to such a view as would exclude tradition as confirmatory of its true meaning. It would be easy to adduce other cases in which Romish theologians do not insist on the existence of any other tradition; and were this the only view maintained generally in that communion, we should have no difficulties on the subject. But it so happens, that the majority of Romanists hold a very different language, and with Bellarmine and his followers, maintain the position, that *part* only of the Divine Revelation designed for our salvation was given to the Church in Holy Scripture, and that the remainder was handed down by oral tradition. And further, we find them exacting an implicit submission to the oral tradition or popular doctrine of the Church existing at the *present day*, without permitting the liberty of ascertaining whether such a tradition has been derived by a continual succession in the Catholic Church.* Here at once is a door opened to the greatest abuses, and we justly object to any such views of Catholic tradition, because they are without foundation in reason or in antiquity; and because, while they are inconsistent with the especial objects for which the Scriptures were written, the *preservation* of the Gospel, which could only be accomplished perfectly if they comprised the *whole* Gospel; they also lead to the introduction of novelties in religion:—the imposition of prevalent *opinions* as matters of faith; and the perversion of ancient tradition in the attempt to bend it to conformity with comparatively modern theories.

But the truth is, that we cannot fairly be required to defend our own position against such principles. We are altogether free from censure, because our sentiments are maintained in the Romish Church itself. Nor can our opponents argue that our doctrine of the completeness of Scripture is erroneous or unsound, because the Synod of Trent itself makes no definition against it. The opinion, we repeat, is nothing more than a private, though it be the common opinion in their communion; and we may fairly set it aside in controversy with them as a matter of uncertainty among themselves, and which they may desert without ceasing to be Romanists.

It would be a great mistake, however, to imagine that we can set aside the tradition of the Church generally, as influencing the

* "If," says Dr. Hawarden, "they (the Arians) be allowed the plea of *all reformers*, I mean of appealing from, and against, the present Catholic Church, to the times past, the controversy can never be ended until the dead speak."—*The True Church of Christ*, vol. ii, Preface, cited by Bishop Jebb in the excellent Appendix to his Sermons.

interpretation of Scripture. We have occasionally heard with regret from some well-meaning people, that in our controversies with Romanists, we ought to adhere strictly to Scripture alone, and not permit ourselves to be drawn into the wide field of discussion which is opened by the doctrines of the Universal Church. Now setting aside the question whether we can prove our *right* to act thus, we would only remark, that our power of preventing this appeal extends to ourselves. We cannot prevent our adversaries from entering on this field of discussion, and the inevitable result of our silence, and of their confident assumptions of conforming with the general sense of Christians from the earliest period, can only be, that the public shall become impressed with the opinion that Romanism, and not the system of our Churches, was the doctrine even of the primitive Church. And when this principle is once established, common sense will lead men to conclude that such a fact ought to outweigh all these interpretations of Scripture which are opposed to Romanism. Men of a pious and an inquiring mind cannot fail to come to this conclusion under such circumstances, and therefore we are most deeply indebted to all who labour in maintaining the truth from the testimony of the Catholic fathers and councils, and who, like Mr. Perceval, exhibit the most perfect and fearless confidence that the voice of all ages is not opposed to our faith. We do not hesitate to say, that strong as our cause is on scriptural grounds, it is still more strongly supported by the tradition of the Church derived by perpetual succession from the Apostles. It may, indeed, require no small share of information to act with effect on this field; and it is much more difficult than it *ought to be*, from particular circumstances: but it were better that our cause should be defended well by a few, than weakly and mischievously by a larger number. But we have wandered from our subject.

The canons of the Synod of Sardica are adduced by Romanists in proof of the Papal power of hearing appeals from all parts of the Church, and therefore in proof of the supremacy. In consequence of the irregular and tyrannical proceedings of the Arians in their deposition of many of the most orthodox bishops, it was resolved by this council that Julius, Bishop of Rome, (an orthodox prelate,) should be invested with the power of directing the cause of a bishop who appealed to him, to be reheard by the bishops of the next province. These canons, which did not empower the Roman bishops to decide causes in their tribunal at Rome, were obviously made to meet a special emergency, and as the most learned Romanists themselves admit, the discipline they introduced was novel in the Church. Mr. Perceval's observations on this subject (pp. 19 and 64) merit attention.

"Canons," he observes, "which were unknown to the Church of Africa within a century of the time when they are stated to have been made, although that Church had no less than thirty-six representatives at the council which is said to have made them (Conc. ii. 656); which, when first noticed in ecclesiastical history, were represented by the Bishop of Rome to be Nicene and not Sardican; which, notwithstanding the mention of the Sardican council in the second canon of the Trullan council, were rejected by the Greeks, as appears from the remonstrance of Pope Nicholas I. to the clergy of Constantinople, in his letter to Photius, as follows:—'In that ye say that ye neither have nor receive the Sardican council, nor the decretals of the holy pontiffs, it is difficult for us to believe you: especially since the whole Church receives the Sardican council, which took place among you in your country; how has it happened that the holy Church of Constantinople should reject it, and not retain it as is fitting?' (Conc. viii. 285,) are totally destitute of all authority. But, waving for the sake of argument, these insuperable objections, and admitting the genuineness of the canons of Sardica, what do they amount to? Simply to this, that the eighty worthy and orthodox bishops there assembled, considering that the emperor for the time being was a favourer of the Arians, (I am giving the probable reason,) judged it expedient to recommend that in certain cases it should rest with Julius, the then Bishop of Rome, to decide whether or not a cause should be reheard."—(pp. 64, 65.)

We do not quite agree with Mr. Perceval in regarding the genuineness of these canons as doubtful (though he is supported by considerable authorities), for this reason, that if they had been forged, we should have expected them to have conferred more decided and extensive power on the Roman see; and they were not only cited frequently by the Roman pontiffs, but inserted in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus and other early canonists; and though it is clear that the Greek and African and other Churches did not acknowledge them, this does not, strictly speaking, prove them forgeries, because it might have arisen from the refusal of those Churches to receive the discipline enacted by the Council of Sardica, and this appears to us the more probable view of the matter.

There is a very valuable note on the first canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, which is generally said to have established the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Without doubt the *term* is employed "*transubstantiatio, pane in corpus, vino in sanguinem, potestate divina*," &c.—p. 133. Mr. Perceval very truly observes, "that the doctrine of transubstantiation, as taught by the Council of Trent, is not necessarily determined by this canon; and many eminent writers of the Roman communion, living in the interval of time between the two Councils, have felt themselves free to defend opinions contrary to it."—p. 346.

Occam and Waldensis are then cited in proof of this assertion. The former, who lived in the fourteenth century, regarded the conversion of the sacramental elements, or their annihilation, as merely *opinions*. The latter observes, in the following century, that some persons preferred to hold such opinions as concede “the essential presence of Christ’s body, and yet *deny not the presence of the bread* still remaining to sustain the appearing accidents.” And hence it is plain that the doctrine of transubstantiation was in those days nothing more than an opinion in the Western Church. The Council of Trent, indeed, established it as a matter of faith, though there are expressions in her decrees which seem to leave some loopholes to escape from their obvious force, as Mr. Perceval observes (p. 372); and there can be no doubt that there have been, in fact, very important differences of opinion amongst Romanists on this subject, though we have been permitted to hear little of them.

It would be well for the Church if the salutary cautions which Mr. Perceval connects with the history of Wickliff, were generally impressed on the minds of our supporters. There has been a disposition (not unnatural, we admit,) to regard him as the founder of the Reformation in England, and his opinions have acquired in the minds of some a weight which they ought not to possess. There has been, indeed, too much of this canonizing of the Reformers: they seem to be viewed almost as impeccable and infallible, and altogether rather in the light of inspired agents, than of men invested with no extraordinary powers, and liable to the infirmities of our common nature. We honour their conduct in many respects. Their zeal, their learning, their perseverance, were conspicuously useful to the Church of England in various points. But few greater evils could be imagined than to identify our religion with the particular notions of even the most eminent names of the Reformation. All were liable to error, and perhaps scarcely any avoided actual error in some respect; but we are not responsible for any thing, except the doctrines, in which all ultimately agreed, and which are comprised in the authorized formularies of the Church of England. Mr. Perceval observes, that as Wickliff is, in some points,

“in common cause with the Church of England, it seemed right to give insertion to the sentence of condemnation against him. It would be, however, a failure of fidelity, and an injury to the Church of England, if it were left without comment, and if it were to be thence inferred that the Church of England is implicated in all Wickliff’s positions. This is far from being the case. Many of his opinions were unsound and unwarranted, and as contrary to the Church Catholic, and the Church of England, as a branch of the same, as they were to the Church of Rome.

Such, for instance, was his view of confirmation, which he ascribed to the devil, (*Trialog.* iv. 14, cited by *Le Bas*, p. 340); his position of the equal authority of bishops and presbyters, a mere revival of the exploded heresy of Aërius, (*Le Bas*, pp. 334, 335); his opinion of Church endowments, which is not exceeded by the most violent voluntary of Red-cross Street, (*Le Bas*, p. 359—362). It would be an error very hurtful to history, and to the truth, which is of more value than victory, if we were to think it necessary to hold up as immaculate those persons who have at any time been permitted to take any part on our side of the Christian warfare, and to wink hard, that we might not see, and be forced to acknowledge, their failings. Our hymn of gratitude to God, for deliverance from Papal bondage, is not interrupted, because he, in his wise counsels, has made the unruly passions of violent men often times subservient to the accomplishment of that work. We are bound to praise the Deliverer, but not to idolize or pervert truth for the sake of all the instruments which he has seen fit to make use of for effecting that deliverance.”—p. 325.

Mr. Perceval's remarks on the decrees of the Synod of Trent, are, perhaps, among the most valuable in his work. They are characterized by a most remarkable spirit of candour, and abound in erudition. Mr. Perceval does not deem it necessary to find evil and abomination in all the decisions of that Council. His principles do not oblige him to exaggerate its errors, nor to conceal its merits. Most assuredly, if we go to the perusal of its decrees with an impression that it is a mere mass of corrupt and unsound doctrine, we are in danger of a reaction of feeling, which may prove highly injurious. There is often much to applaud in the canons of the Synod of Trent, for though it is evident that some of them are injudicious, some presumptuous, and some erroneous, there are many which are directed against wild, and anarchical, and heretical doctrines engendered by the spirit of Ultra-Protestanism, against a crowd of Pelagian, Aërian, Antinomian errors which we ourselves condemn and reject. In many of the decisions of the Synod of Trent, all true members of the Church of England must concur, though of course there are points on which we decidedly differ from them, and altogether repudiate. We shall cite a few passages from Mr. Perceval's Notes on the Council of Trent, which will afford a fair specimen of his general mode of treating his subject. On the chapter “Of the Institution of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction,” he makes the following remarks:—

“Here it is said that the institution of extreme unction by our Lord is implied by Mark, vi. 13, where it is said of the Apostles, that ‘they anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.’ But, by-and-bye, Session 22, ch. 1, we are told that the Christian priesthood

was not instituted until our Lord's last supper. Either, then, extreme unction is no sacrament, or they who are no priests can administer a sacrament; for the Apostles were not priests, according to the Church of Rome. But further, a sacrament is a visible form of invisible grace; but the passage in St. Mark speaks only of healing the body, and therefore Cajetan, as cited by Catharinus, rejects this text as inapplicable to this sacrament; and Suarez (in part iii. disp. 39, sect. 1, n. 5,) says, that where the Apostles are said to anoint the sick, and heal them, (Mark, vi. 13,) this was not said in reference to the sacrament of unction, because their cures had not of themselves an immediate respect to the soul. Nor will this pretended sacrament derive more assistance from a passage in St. James, in which they say, that the institution of our Lord is proclaimed and declared by that Apostle, at least if Cardinal Cajetan is any authority, who is thus cited by Catharinus in his 'Annotationes,' Paris, 1535, p. 191. 'De Sacramento Unctionis Extremæ.—Sed et quod scribit B. Jacobus, Infirmatur quis in vobis, &c. pariter negat reverendissimus ad hoc sacramentum pertinere, ita scribens, nec ex verbis, nec ex effectu, verba hæc loquuntur de sacramentali unctione extremæ unctionis, sed magis de unctione quam instituit Dominus Jesus exercendum in ægrotis. Sextus enim non dicit, Infirmatur quis ad mortem, sed absolute, Infirmatur quis?' &c. But that this rite, which they now call a sacrament, was originally applied chiefly to the healing of the body, is manifest from the prayers which accompanied it. 'Cura quæsumus, Redemptor noster, gratia Spiritus Sancti languores istius infirmi;' and so the directions, '*in loco ubi plus dolor imminet, amplius perungatur.*' Let the patient have most oil applied in the part where the pain is greatest. (*Sacr. Gregor*, by Menard, Paris, 1542, p. 252.) From all which we come to the conclusion, that the allegations of the Council of Trent, on this matter, must be pronounced 'not proven.' Which, if it were a mere opinion, would be of no great consequence. But when their assertion is supported by anathema, and every communicant in their Church bound to believe it as necessary to salvation, it seems to show the cruelty of this Roman mother, both to her own children, and to them whom she reckons strangers. It is in vain that the Roman writers attempt to strengthen their cause by appeals to the Greek mysteries. . . . For in the Greek Church, the service of anointing is used to persons in any illness; and is used by them solely for recovery from sickness, as the following prayer at the application of the oil clearly shows. 'O Holy Father, the physician of our souls and bodies, who didst send thine only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, to heal all diseases, and to deliver us from death, heal this thy servant M. from the bodily infirmity under which he now labours, and raise him up by the grace of Christ.'—(*King's Greek Church*, London, 1772, p. 321.) It will be found also in Goar, *Rituale Græc.* Paris, 1647, p. 417. As to the expediency, or otherwise, of retaining this rite in the Visitation of the Sick, this is nothing to the present purpose. Let it be as expedient as it may, which I am not denying, this in nowise proves it to be a sacrament. To this two things are wanting: 1. The *grace*; 2. The *institution* by Christ. On the former point

we have spoken. As to the latter, when we find Bishop (?) Doyle, in answer to the question 'When did Christ institute it?' obliged to answer, 'The time is uncertain,' some think it was instituted at his last supper; others, 'that it was done betwixt his resurrection and ascension,' (either of which expositions is at variance with the Trent reference to Mark vi.) we may well leave the matter without further comment."—p. 382—384.

The reader will find much valuable matter in these notes on the doctrine of the sacraments (p. 369), of confirmation (371), of auricular confession (pp. 378, 385), invocation of saints (405), infallibility (403); but our limits do not permit us to do more than make this general reference. The observations on "the Sacrifice of the Mass" are, however, calculated to be so useful, that we cannot conclude without introducing them in part to the reader.

"The service of the Holy Eucharist being two-fold, a sacrifice and a sacrament, care must be taken, lest in explaining the nature of it, or opposing errors concerning it, we so magnify one portion as to put the other out of sight; 'lest of two parts we have but one.' Our quarrel with the Church of Rome in this matter, is not that she has termed this holy rite a sacrifice, but that, in defining the nature of that sacrifice, she has countenanced errors of the most fearful kind. I say countenanced, rather than inculcated; because, notwithstanding all that has been said upon the subject, the definitions of the Council of Trent will, upon examination, be found to be so vague, so inconsistent, so self-contradictory, as to afford latitude for almost any explanation; and in point of practice, the most different opinions upon the point have been broached and openly maintained by different individuals in the Roman communion. Thus, while Harding, the Jesuit, contends that 'Christ was twice immolated,' has *twice* shed his blood, once in the Eucharist, and once on the cross; and that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is a *reiteration* of that upon the cross: while Le Quien maintains that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is a real sacrifice, and a *continuation* of that upon the cross; (Tom. II. p. 274, cited by Conrayer in his Defence, ii. 146;) Cardinal Perron, du S. Sacr. de l'Eucharistie, Paris, 1622, p. 348, declares that the Christian sacrifice is a *figure* or *pattern* (figure ou exemplaire) of that upon the Cross: Cassander that Christ is there offered by *mystical representation* and *commemoration*; 'idem illud corpus Christi ex ipsius mandato, quotidie offerunt per mysticam repræsentationem et commemorationem sacrificii semel peracti. . . . Sacrificii Christi in imagine repræsentatio, quo non efficitur nova propitiatio et remissio peccatorum, sed ea quæ semel sufficienter in cruce facta est, nobis quoque efficax esse postulatur'—(Op. p. 998, Paris, 1668, cited by Conrayer, Defence of his Dissertation, ii. p. 177), and Cardinal Richlieu, that a *mystical* and *figurative* death is sufficient to establish the essence of a true sacrifice.

"That these and many more varieties of opinion may all find shelter and excuse in the Tridentine decrees, will be plain to all who consider that the Fathers in that council declare Christ's presence there to be not

natural, but only sacramental; yet at the same time substantial, but so that it is also supersubstantial; that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is only *representative* of that upon the cross; and yet that at the same time it is of itself *propitiatory*, for that the same Christ is contained and offered up in it, and that the difference between the two is only in the *manner of the offering*: but that notwithstanding it is only *applicative of the saving virtue of the others*.”—p. 388—390.

The same interesting subject is again treated with much learning and candour in the note, pp. 392, 397, where Mr. Perceval remarks as follows on those words of the Synod: “He instituted a new passover, even *Himself to be sacrificed by the Church, &c.*”

“If by this is meant that our Lord is really and actually sacrificed in the Eucharist, as Harding contended, it is simple downright blasphemy. If all that it means is, that there is a commemorative sacrifice of his death; in other words, that the oblation of bread and wine in obedience to his institution, is an action representing, and commemorating, and *presenting before God*, that great and only sacrifice; which sense is warranted by the context, and in this sense it is used by many of their most eminent writers,—we have no objections to offer to it. For in this sense it has been again and again acknowledged by our most eminent divines. Thus *Archbishop Bramhall*, in his works, Dublin, 1677, p. 36. ‘We acknowledge a representation of that sacrifice to God the Father, we acknowledge an impetration of the benefit of it, we maintain an application of its virtue: so here is a commemorative, impetrative sacrifice.’ *Mede*, Christian Sacrifice, book ii. c. 7. ‘The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, or the Lord’s Supper, is a sacrifice according to the style of the ancient Church. It is one thing to say that the Lord’s Supper is a sacrifice, and another to say that Christ is properly sacrificed therein.’ (Ibid. c. 9.) ‘Although the Eucharist be a sacrifice, yet is Christ in this sacrifice no otherwise offered than by way of commemoration only of his sacrifice once offered. But this commemoration which is to be made to God his Father, is not, as is commonly supposed, a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind, but a putting God in mind. The commemoration therein must be made to God.’—*Mason, Vindic. Eccles. Anglic. Lond.* 1625, p. 566.”

Other passages are cited in illustration of the accordant views of Bishop Jewell, Archbishop Cranmer, and Bishop Andrewes; and a comparison is instituted between their doctrine and that of several eminent Romish theologians, as Cardinal Perron, De Marca, Mæratus, Chingius, Hosius, Cassander, &c., from which the following conclusions are deduced.

“These extracts, to which others, if needs be, could be added, suffice to show the wisdom of that caution with which the Church of England has expressed herself in the thirty-first article upon this point: ‘The sacrifices of masses in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.’ When it is

considered by whom the articles were drawn up, it is clear that this condemnation is not directed against the sacrifice of the mass understood as Cranmer expounded it, (see above, p. 398), but against such a gross actual sacrifice as that for which Harding and other writers of the Roman communion have contended : but which is wholly disclaimed by the writers I have adduced, since the Council of Trent, and is at utter variance with the collective exposition of the chapter of Cologne, a few years before the council. The article does not hold out the notion which it condemns as one authoritatively taught in the Church of Rome ; but as a common report or superstition upon the subject. Many English persons have supposed that the framers of the article had the Tridentine decrees in view, and put forth their article with the express view of condemning those decrees ; but such persons forget that the English articles were passed in 1552, and the Tridentine decrees upon the mass not till ten years afterwards."—p. 395—396.

We must now take our leave of Mr. Perceval with an expression of sincere obligation for the pleasure and profit we have derived in many ways from the perusal of his valuable work ; and with a recommendation to those who are especially interested in the Romish controversy, to possess themselves without delay of this very useful, learned, and interesting volume.

ART. X.—*Journey through Arabia Petraea to Mount Sinai and the Excavated City of Petra, the Edom of the Prophecies.*
By M. Léon de Laborde. London : John Murray. 1836.
pp. 331.

WHEN those who think in their heart, that they "be truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this united Church of *England and Ireland*, to the order and ministry of priesthood," are presented to the bishop for ordination, one of the questions put by the reverend Father in God to them is the following :—"Will you be diligent in prayers and in reading of the holy Scriptures, *and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same*, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?" To which answer is made in the following words :—"I will endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being my helper." Such is the answer made ; and it was by the bearing of it in mind and the holding to it, that our elder divines, those giants of former times, as they were called by the good king, became not only mighty in the Scriptures, but in all that related to them,

whether it were history, geography or any other collateral study; so that what honest Barnabas Oley said of the "reverend, learned and pious" Doctor Jackson, sometime President of Corpus Christi College in Oxford, might be said of the better part of those excellent worthies, whose works are a standing armoury from which the church militant may ever draw the weapons of her warfare. "Dr. Jackson had in his youth (as if he then had understood God's calling) laid his grounds carefully in arithmetic, grammar, philology, geometry, rhetoric, logic, philosophy, oriental languages, histories, &c. (yea, he had an insight into heraldry and hieroglyphics), *he made all these serve either as rubbish under the foundation, or as strudges and day-labourers to theology.*" Of course we do not mean in making this quotation to imply the necessity of that list of studies enumerated, but simply to show how all that a man reads may, so to say, be turned to gold. Even in his youth a man may, as Doctor Thomas Jackson* did, lay by stores for more advanced years, and, if called to the ministry, use them in his vocation. But after ordination the holy Scriptures, and such studies as shall help to the knowledge of the same, are the peculiar province of *the man of God*, and in these he is to exercise himself, that he may have a right judgment in scriptural matters, and rightly divide the word of truth. And thus, as we said above, was it with our elder divines.

"Such prompt eloquence
Flow'd from their lips, in prose or numerous verse,
More tuneable than needed lute or harp
To add more sweetness."—*Pur. Lost*, v. 149.

But it may be imagined by what is here said that we would restrain the discursive reading of the clergy, and confine them to a puritanic and unhealthy course of study. Nothing, however, is farther from our purpose; and we are much of the same mind with Bishop Hacket, who declared that he never read any work in the week which did not in some way or other help him on with his Sunday's sermon. His motto also is one much to our mind, "praise God and be cheerful." For in the words of one† not long departed, "from the mismanagement of ages religion is

* See what Jones of Nayland, in his *Life of Bishop Horne*, says of Jackson, *Works*, vol. vi. pp. 75, 76. Amongst other things he speaks of him as "a magazine of theological learning," and concludes with the following high tribute to his worth:—"that there cannot be in the Church of England a useful scholar, unless he is precise in following the same track of learning, I will not presume to say; but this I shall always think, that if ever we are to see another Mr. Horne, a commentator so learned, a preacher so evangelical, a writer so accomplished, a Christian so exemplary, he must come out of the same school."

† Bishop Jebb. See *Practical Theology*, vol. ii. p. 110.

commonly accounted an austere and gloomy task-mistress; and in order to subdue this prejudice, which, above all others, impedes the progress of religion, we want examples of cheerful Christianity, sufficiently numerous, to afford a practical confutation." What, then, we would venture to advise is this—let a *cheerful severity* proceed from the sanctuary; let the scope of a minister's reading be practical edification, even when the works of the day are taken up to refresh and delight the mind; but let his *studies* be as he promised at his ordination, such as shall *help to the knowledge of the holy Scriptures*.

Now amongst all other books which can be procured, none are more likely to assist the ministry on this point than such as relate to the history, geography, and chorography of those countries which stand forth prominently in the pages of the Bible. Hereby, ourselves untravelled, we are enabled to travel over those lands trod by His "sacred feet," who eighteen hundred years ago was manifest in the flesh for our salvation:—hereby our better feelings are awakened and turned into worship;—and looking to the Jerusalem which is above, we visit, as it were, in person the Jerusalem below, and acknowledge the "spirit of prophecy" still hovering over it, and confess to the oracles of truth, not a syllable of which has fallen to the ground. And although "it matters not to any man's salvation to know the accurate distance between Jericho and Jerusalem, and he that hath climbed to the top of Mount Libanus is not in respect of his soul a hair's breadth nearer to heaven," yet "these studies are ornamental, to accomplish mere knowledge, contributing much to the true understanding of the history of the Bible."

Accordingly this religious and useful knowledge has not been overlooked by the divines of our Church. Lightfoot, for example, promised to set forth as an accompaniment to his *Harmony of the Evangelists*, "a chorographical description of the land of Canaan, and those adjoining places that we have occasion to look upon as we read the Gospels;" and was only hindered from so doing by finding that "another workman, a far better artist than myself, had the description of the land of Israel not only in hand, but even in the press; and was so far got before me in that travel, that he was almost at his journey's end when I was but little more than setting out." The whole account of this curious piece of literary intelligence may be seen in the thirty-seventh chapter* of that (perhaps) most remarkable production of the

* See vol. ii. p. 40. For the fact of Lightfoot's relinquishing his work, see Appendix to his *Life* in the folio edition of his works, vol. i. p. xii. Fuller's *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine* was printed in 1650.

present day, we mean the Doctor, &c., where that little affix, the &c., points to a fund of information as abundant as it is delightful. The workman that forestalled Lightfoot was the celebrated Fuller, who, in his introductory chapter wherein his design is asserted from causeless cavils, amongst other has these remarks :—

“ Remarkable is that passage of the Apostle, Acts, xvii. 26, ‘ *And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;*’ wherein we may see divinity the queen waited on by three of her principal ladies of honour, namely, skill in

“ I. Genealogies, concerning the persons of men and their pedigrees, *of one blood all nations*.

“ II. Chronology, in the exact computation *of the times afore appointed*.

“ III. Geography, measuring out the limits of several nations, *and the bounds of their habitations*.”

The curious work from which the above is taken is the mine, probably, from which most successive writers on those subjects have drawn their stores. Like all the rest of honest Fuller's works, it is quaint, interesting and instructive. It is entitled “A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine and the Confines thereof, with the History of the Old and New Testament acted thereon.”

Having made these introductory remarks, we may now pass on to the more particular subject of this article, in which we would wish (amid the present strife of tongues and Edomitish clamour against the Church) to enliven the pages of this review by extracts from the very interesting work prefixed to our observations, a translation chiefly from the French.

Ere we proceed to draw upon its contents, we may observe that it is beautifully got up and full of plates, more particularly illustrative of the ruins of Petra. If we were inclined to be critical, there are certain parts (additions of the translator) which we might animadvert upon as somewhat carelessly thrown together; and we might produce certain references which are evidently second hand. In the translation itself also are to be found many Gallicisms, which the hand of a more cunning workman would have expunged. These, however, when compared with the whole work, are but minor matters, and we can safely recommend it both for its contents and for its beauty.

Thus much as concerns the Translator. As to the Author himself, the enterprizing M. Léon de Laborde, though he also has

certain speculative opinions in his historical details of Arabia, and as relates to

“ The fugitive bond-woman, with her son
Outcast Nebaioth,”

we are nevertheless delighted with his labours, and rejoice to find another conclusive proof of that beautiful expression of Newton's which declares that PROPHECY IS A GROWING EVIDENCE. The original work of M. Léon de Laborde was published at Paris, in the year 1830, in a large folio size. The difference between the volume before us and the original may be given in the words of the Translator's Preface :—

“ The volume now before the reader differs from that of M. de Laborde in several particulars. In the first place, I found it necessary to prefix to his matter two chapters comprising an account of ancient Idumea, as far as I could collect it from authentic sources ; and a summary of the remarks made upon Petra by the few travellers who had preceded Messrs. de Laborde and Linant in the toil of examining the marvellous remains of that once magnificent capital, (Petra.) Secondly, I have endeavoured to exhibit, in one continuous narrative, the whole of the details which the author had scattered through a preface, an introduction, an explanation of the plates, and a sort of itinerary, which is confined to the route from Suez to Akaba. This narrative I have occasionally illustrated by notes from the interesting productions of Burckhardt, Irby and Mangles,* and Sir F. Henniker. Some incidental dissertations not intimately connected with the main object of the publication, I have omitted or abridged, with a view to render the work somewhat more attractive to the general reader than it probably would have been, had I confined my labours to a mere version of the original.” —pp. xviii. xix.

It has so happened, that, living at a distance from the press, we have not been enabled to examine the original French work, as we could have wished,—but the great object of M. de Laborde's travel was to examine that ancient city Petra, which, with the mountainous character of the land, gave name to Arabia Petræa. This Petra is supposed to be the Hebrew Selah, the capital of the Edomites,—both of which words signify the rock,—taken by Amaziah, as recorded in 2 Kings, xiv. 7 : *He slew of Edom in the valley of salt ten thousand, and took Selah (margin, or, the rock,) by war, and called the name of it Joktheel unto this day.* It is severally called in different authors either a city of Arabia or Palestina Tertia, as it may happen ; and for this reason it finds a place in the learned work of Hadrian Reland. His

* To this work the translator pays a very just tribute of praise. We wish it were published. A printed private presentation copy is before us, and we shall have occasion to refer to it presently.

words are, "Notum est urbem hanc olim Arabiæ tributam fuisse et ipsam inde nomen tulisse partem illius regionis Petream dictam. Quod nisi Palæstinæ postea fuisset addita, indictam illam in hoc opere præterissemus; sed quum Palæstinæ tertiæ metropolis fuerit, omninò hic locum habere debet."* This city, which, from late researches, has once more become the object of our wonder, and has increased, if we may so say, the faith of believers, till within late years was completely hidden from our view; and for that reason the word of prophecy relating to it appeared as vague and difficult as it now turns out to be wonderfully true. Of course the believer, who walks by faith and not by sight, knew well that every word which the Prophets uttered in vision, was the word of God, who, by his Holy Spirit, moved them to speak,—but hitherto, until the discoveries of Burckhardt, Banks and Legh, Irby and Mangles, we knew not of the existence still of that city which lay hid in the clefts of the rock, and was builded as high as the nest of the eagle. So far, indeed, was this city from being known, that the territory of Edom had been unvisited, and was only noticed so lately as the time of Volney, whose travels in Egypt and Syria were first published in 1787, and certainly with no intent to verify the word of the Bible. Nevertheless, *out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness*† for, from the report of the Arabs to Volney, that within three days' journey to the south-east of the Dead Sea, there were upwards of thirty ruined towns absolutely deserted, the curiosity of travellers was excited; and it is probably to this report of the Arabs of Bakir, and the inhabitants of Gaza, that we owe the light which has been thrown on the hitherto dark and sack-cloth-shrouded prophecies concerning Edom.

As relates to the former wealth and power of Edom it concerns us to speak no further than to say that it was once a mart of trade, and mighty in its terribleness and its pride;—the question with which we have to deal is: how came it that *the line of confusion and the stones of emptiness* should have declared, and should still declare, its desolation? And here we are not left in doubt. Prophecy opens upon us, and we see in that destruction which has fallen upon the land of Edom, the destruction that Edom would have had to fall on Jacob, when she instigated Nebuchadnezzar to demolish the walls of Sion. A remnant, however, was left; and the plaintive songs of the captive exiles, who sat down by the waters of Babylon in tears, and hanged their harps upon the willows thereof, did not fail to reach the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth, when they lifted up their voices, saying, *Remember the*

* See Hadrian! Relandi *Palæstina ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata*, tom. ii. p. 926.

† Judges, xiv. 14.

children of Edom, O Lord, in the day of Jerusalem, how they said, Down with it, down with it, even to the ground. And truly they were remembered, as the prophecies which follow concerning them declared they should be. These we may be excused for quoting somewhat at length :—

My sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. The sword of the Lord is filled with blood. The Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. It is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion. From generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever. But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it: and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion and the stones of emptiness. They shall call the nobles thereof to the kingdom, but none shall be there, and all her princes shall be nothing. And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof: and it shall be an habitation of dragons, and a court for owls. The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech-owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest. There shall the great owl make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shadow; and there shall the vultures also be gathered, every one with her mate.—Isai. xxxiv. 5—15.*

“Concerning Edom, thus saith the Lord of Hosts: Is wisdom no more in Teman? is counsel perished from the prudent? is their wisdom vanished? I have made Esau bare, I have uncovered his secret places, and he shall not be able to hide himself: his seed is spoiled, and his brethren, and his neighbours, and he is not. I have sworn by myself, saith the Lord, that Bozrah shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste, and a curse; and all the cities thereof shall be perpetual wastes. For, lo, I will make thee small

* It is not easy to assign a reason why our translators have adopted this word. Vitranga on Isai. xiii. 21, remarks, “Sententia mea est, traditionem de Satyris, originem suam traxisse, exanimantibus quibusdam, vere animantibus hujus speciei, Αἰγοπριθήκοις, h. e. simiis caprinæ speciei et satyrorum quales pinguntur simillimis.” Vol. i. p. 414, apud Horsley. Claudius Rich has a note upon it in his Second Memoir on the Ruins of Ancient Babylon. He thinks that the word was probably introduced on the authority of Aben Ezra, and adds the following curious piece of information: “Since the above was written I find that the belief of the existence of Satyrs is by no means rare in this country. The Arabs call them Sied Assad, and say that they abound in some woody places near Semara, on the Euphrates,” p. 31. The Hebrew word means “hairy ones.” In the LXX. δαιμόνια, i. e. devils. The old rendering of “apes” would be easier understood. According to Barthelémy the word CATYPOC occurs on the Mosaic pavement of Præneste, as descriptive of an ape or baboon.

among the heathen, and despised among men. Thy terribleness hath deceived thee and the pride of thine heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill: though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord. Also Edom shall be a desolation: every one that goeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss at all the plagues thereof. As in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighbour cities thereof, saith the Lord, no man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it. Hear the counsel of the Lord, that he hath taken against Edom; and his purposes, that he hath purposed against the inhabitants of Teman: surely, the least of the flock shall draw them out: surely he shall make their habitations desolate with them. The earth is moved at the noise of their fall, at the cry the noise thereof was heard in the Red Sea. Behold he shall come up and fly as the eagle, and spread his wings over Bozrah; and at that day shall the heart of the mighty men of Edom be as the heart of a woman in her pangs.—Jer. xlix. 7—22.

But we find it would occupy too much of our space were we to go on with the prophecies of Ezekiel and Obadiah,—we must therefore refer our readers to Bishop Newton. But even in his Dissertations and in all the Commentators something was wanting to fill up that entire desolation,—that utter excision of man and city,—described and foretold by the prophets. History informs us (and beyond that, till lately, we knew nothing more,) that within a century after Christ the name of Edomite was lost and disused, as the distinguishing name of the nation, being swallowed up in that of the Nabathæan Arabs;—or if used at all, it was used to express cruelty, and loftiness, and arrogance, and pride, and haughtiness of heart. And hence, from that date, the land that was once the land of riches, and might, and prosperity, has been scarce inhabited. The Arab only pitcheth his tent there, whose hand is against every man, and every man's hand against his. Who, when he readeth these prophecies, and seeth the event, can forget the Apostolic precept, *Let brotherly love continue?* Edom is not, and judgment was denounced against Mount Seir, for their hatred to Israel, and their violence to their brother Jacob.

According to the word of prophecy, so has every one found the travelling in the ancient Idumea,—full of danger and difficult in the extreme. But the danger has been met, and the difficulty overcome. The traveller whose book is before us was determined, if possible, to succeed in his attempt; and, as we have before remarked, he has filled up what was wanting in Burckhardt and later travellers. Prophecy has received light (so to

say) from his labours;—the space between Akaba and Petra has been found to have been filled with ancient cities, now desolate and in ruins,—it is utterly waste,—the Arab may pass and repass, and pitch his tent in the defiles,—but no man dwelleth there. Whatever may hereafter happen, at present Edom is desolate from Teman. Teman or Maan is the last place inhabited. This general statement having been made, we are now brought to that particular fulfilment of the prophecies declared in the discovery of the long lost Petra; and, as we have not space to give in detail the accounts of Strabo and Pliny, we must refer our readers to the preliminary chapters of this work. Before, however, we can reach Petra, some description of the route seems requisite. For this we transcribe a part of the fifteenth chapter.

“The singular construction of Arabia Petræa renders a description of it difficult, even to him who has drawn up the map, by which this volume is accompanied. Mount Libanus, after having exhibited its bold peaks, crowned with snow, to the plains of Homs and Hama, divides itself into two branches, one of which is called Libanus, the other anti-Libanus. These two great branches extend themselves toward the south, allowing the Nahar-el-Casma to run between them, and farther on the Jordan, to which they give a continued direction, not only through the lake of Tiberias,* but as far as the Dead Sea, which now interrupts its course, but also in a straight line in the midst of Wady Araba, which stretches as far as the Red Sea, and bears evident traces of having been anciently the bed of a river.

“This valley of the Jordan, Wady Araba, which was for a long time unknown, though discovered again by Burckhardt, who traversed it to some extent, has never been fully explored by any European traveller. I have described its direction and appearance to a distance of about twenty-two leagues, and no doubt can now remain, I imagine, that at a remote period the Jordan flowed to it to the sea.† Wady Araba, since it has been deserted by the river, has become encumbered in some parts with heaps of sand; but enclosed as it is between mountains of granite and porphyry, there can be no doubt as to its natural and ancient direction. It is bordered on both sides by the prolongations of Libanus; on the west, the mountain, which is here composed of chalk and limestone, pretty regular in its form, rises in a tabled shape to a level with the desert of Tih, which commands a great part of the valley. On the east, to the contrary, (on the contrary, to the east?) high rocks of granite, fractured into a thousand forms, extend from north to

* Benjamin of Tudela considered, and justly, the lake of Tiberias as a part of the Jordan, which was simply enlarged at that place.—*Note*.

† What is said in the text relative to the volcanic eruption,—the swallowing up of the slime pits,—and the formation of the Lacus Asphaltites, is omitted in our extract. It does not militate, perhaps, against the word of Scripture; but it would seem to imply a further knowledge than we actually possess. See the remarks of Sir Thomas Browne, “Of the Situations of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, in the Dead Sea.”—*Works*, vol. iv. p. 221. Ed. Wilkin.

south, and exhibit a chain of from ten to twelve leagues in width, which separates Arabia Petræa from the great desert of sand. These rocks of granite composition occupy, from Akaba as far almost as Wady Garandel, a space of about ten leagues; they are then covered with chalk and limestone, which extend five leagues to the north and north-east, and then disappear amidst rocks of sand-stone, veined with oxyde of iron, and presenting more fantastic shapes than any other part of the mountain. The most eastern continuation of this chain, which is clothed with vegetable earth, is characterized by a regular, firm, and an unbroken course. It appears but slightly elevated when seen from the east, but it declines rapidly towards the west, evidently proving the elevation of the level of the plain above the bed of Wady Araba.

“All this part of the mountain, the only tract covered with earth, bears every mark of ancient cultivation. Stones, which have been arranged to mark the limits of fields, as well as the ruins of separate habitations and villages scattered everywhere over this elevated country, still attest the industry of its former inhabitants in cultivating an apparently unfriendly soil, but which, nevertheless, offered many advantages on account of the security it derived from its proximity to the capital.”—p. 259—263.

Such was the way by which this enterprising traveller approached the celebrated Petra, and we may remark that a double route is now known, as Irby and Mangles arrived there from Hebron by the south of the Dead Sea, somewhat in the old track from Wady Mousa to Gaza, at least as far as Hebron. We do not recollect that M. de Laborde has anywhere directly stated the distance from Araba to Petra; and it cannot be ascertained exactly from the time they were on their journey, as they were detained by an accident which happened to M. Linant's camel. However, from the scale of miles, and from some occasional mention of leagues, it would not appear at the most to be more than one hundred and twenty miles. And thus, owing to the extreme malediction which had passed upon Edom, did her ancient capital lie hid, and remained untenanted, whilst caravans touched at Akaba on their way from Cairo to Mecca. Nay Petra, according to the prophecy, became *despised among men*, and the very Arabs give it a ridiculous and indecent name.*

But, as we have shown the way the traveller took from Akaba, we may now follow him on his journey. Let the reader, then, look to the map; or, if he have it not at hand, let him imagine the Wady Garandel to be nearly three parts of the way to the opening which leads to Wady Mousa. Here he halted, and the valley exhibited by its verdure a most welcome contrast to the desolate wastes around it. “But the halt here was but for a while. We

* Translation, p. 155.

left this place in the afternoon, and for some hours travelled through a bleak wilderness." The narrative then proceeds.

"Night fell upon this miserable looking country, as if to veil its desolation, when we halted. The caravan, already for some time much fatigued, was expecting impatiently the signal of repose. Djazi stopped, and each man having caused his camel to lie down, and having relieved it from its burden, chose on the sand the spot where he was to sleep. In a few minutes the animals formed a circle, in the middle of which we all lay down. A breeze which slightly agitated the surface of the desert, and the sound of the animals quietly ruminating around us, scarcely disturbed the magical stillness of the scene.

"We set out the next morning for the mysterious valley of Petra, that destination towards which all my hopes had been directed for nearly two years. At nine o'clock the tomb of the prophet Aaron was pointed out to us, on the summit of Mount Hor, as well as the rocks adjacent to it, which overlook Wady Mousa. They are more jagged, and higher than the others, and seem to be the crest of the whole mass. The traveller proceeding from the south should distinguish between two peaks; that which contains the tomb of the prophet is higher, but at the same time less striking than an isolated peak to the west of it, overhung by a tree which is apt to deceive the observer with the idea of its being an edifice."

From this point the travellers were no longer in Wady Araba; and having now entered on a small plain much intersected by channels formed by torrents in the rainy season, their guides requested that they should halt there until the heat of the day should pass over. This they assented to; and, when they were again about to take their departure for Petra, the accident before alluded to happened to M. Linant's camel. This detained them till the next day; and they were obliged to take up their quarters for the night in the Wady Pabouchebe, beneath some rocks which projected so as to protect them from the dews. This accident and this detention led to a curious discovery, namely, the cause of the resistance made by the Fellahs of Wady Mousa to Messrs. Bankes, Irby and Mangles. This originated from the jealousy between Ahmed-Raschid and old Aboudjazi, who at that time commanded nearly the half of the tribe. We have not space for the account at large, but it may be seen in p. 144—146. After their night's rest the travellers again set forth, the valley of Pabouchebe growing narrower as they proceeded.

"We wound round a peak surmounted by a single tree.* The view

* If any of our readers should chance to have travelled the road between Llanymynech, or Llantsenfraidd and Llanfyllin in Montgomeryshire, they may have observed and have been delighted with the effect of the single trees on the high grounds above Bodfâch,—a sweet spot!

from that point exhibited a vast frightful desert,—a chaotic sea, the waves of which were petrified. Following the beaten road, we saw before us Mount Hor, crowned by the tomb of the prophet, if we are to credit the ancient traditions preserved by the people of that country. Several large and ruinous excavations, which are seen in the way, may arrest the attention of a traveller, who is interested by such objects, and has no notion of those still concealed from his view by the curtain of rocks which extends before him. But at length the road leads him to the heights above one more ravine, whence he discovers within his horizon the most singular spectacle, the most enchanting picture, which nature has wrought in her grandest mood of creation, which men influenced by the vainest dreams of ambition have yet bequeathed to the generations which were to follow them. At Palmyra nature renders the works of man insignificant by her own immensity and her boundless horizon, within which some hundreds of columns seem entirely lost; here, on the contrary, she appears delighted to set in her own noble frame-work his productions, which aspire, and not unsuccessfully, to harmonize with her own majestic but fantastic appearance. The spectator hesitates for a moment as to which of the two he is the more to admire,—whether he is to accord the preference to nature, who invites his attention to her matchless girdle of rocks, wondrous as well for their colour as their forms, or to the men who feared not to mingle the works of their genius with such splendid efforts of creative power.”—p. 147—150.

Here then, in the heart of Wady Mouse, hedged in by huge perpendicular cliffs and precipices, is that ancient city, the city Petra, or Sela, or Jokteel, through which, in former days, lay the route from Gaza to Akaba. But the curse of Edom was upon it, and it fell, and (as far as Europeans are concerned) was unknown till the time of the enterprizing Burckhardt, who lighted upon it, as it were, by chance, and little thought, it may be, of the light it threw on the words of the prophet; O THOU THAT DWELLEST IN THE CLEFTS OF THE ROCK, AND HOLDEST THE HEIGHT OF THE HILL; THOUGH THOU SHOULDEST MAKE THY NEST AS HIGH AS THE EAGLE, I WILL BRING THEE DOWN FROM THENCE, SAITH THE LORD.

From the descriptions given of this long hid city, both by Irby and Mangles, as well as by M. de Laborde, it must indeed be a new wonder of the world, and the greater wonder, inasmuch as it is a key to ancient prophecy. The sepulchres and buildings cut out in the living rock “in numbers numberless,” and tier above tier,—the highly finished temples and arches,—the labour of the water-courses,—every thing, in short, belonging to it strikes the mind with astonishment, and from its desolateness—*its line of confusion and stones of emptiness*—almost appals the sense; more awful far, than

“Syria’s marble ruins towering high
Above the sandy desert, in the light
Of sun or moon.”

We must endeavour, however, to give some idea of these wonders by extracts, though, after all, without the plan, it must be very vague. The annexed extract is from Irby and Mangles, and it is given somewhat at length, because it seems more fully to represent to the reader a *coup-d'œil* of the vast necropolis of Petra than the particular detail of Laborde.

"To return to the description of the eastern approach to Petra: as we advanced, the natural features of the defile grew more and more imposing at every step, and the excavations and sculpture more frequent on both sides, till it presented at last a continued street of tombs, beyond which the rocks gradually approaching each other, seemed all at once to close without any outlet. There is, however, one frightful chasm for the passage of the stream, which furnishes, as it did anciently, the only avenue to Petra on this side. It is impossible to conceive any thing more awful or sublime than such an approach; the width is not more than just sufficient for the passage of two horsemen abreast, the sides are in all parts perpendicular, varying from four hundred to seven hundred feet in height, and they often overhang to such a degree, that, without their absolutely meeting, the sky is intercepted and completely shut out for one hundred yards together, and there is little more light than in a cavern.

"The screaming of the eagles, hawks, and owls, which were soaring above our heads in considerable numbers, seemingly annoyed at any one approaching their lonely habitation, added much to the singularity of this scene. The tamarisk, the wild fig, and the oleander, grow luxuriantly about the road, rendering the passages often difficult; in some places they hang down most beautifully from the cliffs and crevices where they had taken root: the caper plant was also in luxuriant growth, the continued shade furnishing them with moisture.

"Very near the first entrance into this romantic pass, a bold arch is thrown across at a great height, connecting the opposite sides of the cliff. Whether this was part of an upper road on the summit of the mountain, or whether it be a portion of an aqueduct,* which seems less probable, we had no opportunity of examining; but as the traveller passes under it, its appearance is most surprising, hanging thus above his head betwixt two rugged masses apparently inaccessible. Immediately under it are sculptured niches in the rock, destined probably for statues; and we suspect, that by careful inspection, inscriptions might be found there; but the position in which they are viewed is disadvantageous, and the height so great, that it would require a good glass to distinguish them. Further down, upon a much lower level, there is an object frequently repeated in sculpture along the road-side, which we were at a loss to explain: an altar is represented in a niche, upon which is set a mass of lumpish form, sometimes square, and sometimes curved in its

* "The novel arrangement of this arch induced me at first to suppose that it served as a bridge from one side of the ravine to the other, or as the conduit for the waters to an aqueduct which was formed along the base of the rocks. I ascended to it by a steep and rugged path with great difficulty; but I found nothing to justify the idea that the arch had been intended for any other purpose than as an ornament to the capital."—Laborde, p. 173.

outline, or rising in other instances to a sharper or obtuser cone; in one instance three of them are coupled together in one niche. It might possibly be a representation of the god Terminus, or perhaps one of the stones which were objects of worship amongst the Arabs, down to the time of the coming of Mohammed. The number of these representations on the face of the rock is very considerable; in some instances there are many, almost contiguous, with Greek inscriptions on them, all of which are too much defaced to be of use in explaining their object. The ravine, without changing much its general direction, presents so many elbows and windings in its course, to which the track, of necessity, conforms, that the eye can seldom penetrate forward beyond a few paces, and is often puzzled to distinguish in what direction the passage will open, so completely does it appear obstructed."—p. 414—416.

"We followed this sort of half subterranean passage for the space of nearly two miles, the sides increasing in height as the path continually descended, while the tops of the precipices retained their former level. Where they are at the highest, a beam of stronger light breaks in at the close of the dark perspective, and opens to view, half seen at first, through the tall narrow opening, columns, statues, and cornices, of a light and finished taste, as if fresh from the chisel, without the tints or weather stains of age, and executed in a stone of a pale rose colour, which was warmed at the moment we came in sight of them with the full light of the morning sun. The dark green of the shrubs, which grow in this perpetual shade, and the sombre appearance of the passage from whence we were about to issue, formed a fine contrast with the glowing colour of the edifice. We know not with what to compare this scene; perhaps there is nothing in the world that resembles it; only a portion of a very extensive architectural elevation is seen at first, but it has been so contrived that a statue with expanded wings,* perhaps of Victory, just fills the centre of the aperture in front, which, being closed below by the sides of the rock folding over each other, gives to the figure the appearance of being suspended in the air at a considerable height; the ruggedness of the cliffs below setting off the sculpture to the highest advantage. The rest of the design opened gradually at every pace as we advanced, till the narrow defile, which had continued thus far without any increase of breadth, spreads on both sides into an open area of a moderate size, whose sides are by nature inaccessible, and present the same awful and romantic features as the avenues which lead to it. The position is one of the most beautiful that could be imagined for the front of a great temple, the richness and exquisite finish of whose decorations offer a most remarkable contrast to the savage scenery which surrounds it."—*Irby and Mangles*, pp. 418, 419.

Thus far Irby and Mangles, whose account answers exactly to

* Most probably. Aristophon says that Cupid's wings were cut off for his insolent behaviour in heaven, and given to Victory. Hence we find the epithet applied in our own poets. So Massinger's *Maid of Honour*, act i. sc. 2, "plumed Victory." The concluding words of Aristophon's lines, in Athenæus, run thus, (lib. xiii. 563, b.)

τὰς δὲ πτέρυγας ἃς εἶχε τῇ Νίκῃ φερεῖν
ἴδισαν, περὶφανὲς σκεῦος ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων.

the more precise statements of M. de Laborde. The temple here referred to, is Kasr Faraoun, or the Khasné—the “Treasury of Pharoah.” The particulars will be found in p. 166—172; but without the plates they would be nearly unintelligible. We can only, therefore, give the conclusion of what relates to it.

“The Arabs, as I have said, call this tomb the Treasury of Pharoah. It was in consonance with the usual turn of their minds, after having examined in vain all the coffins of the funereal monuments, to search for the place where Pharoah, the founder of such costly edifices, had buried his wealth. They found the depository, as they conceived, at last, in the urn which is seen surmounting the Khasné. Here, thought they, all the riches of that great sovereign must be preserved. Unhappily, being out of their reach, it has served only the more to kindle their desires. Hence, whenever they pass through the ravine, they stop for a moment, charge their guns, aim at the urn, and endeavour, by firing at it, to break off some fragments, with a view to demolish it altogether, and get at the treasure which it is supposed to contain. The urn, however, resists their attacks; and when they have discharged their pieces in vain, they go away murmuring against the giant-king, who had the cunning to place his treasure at a distance of a hundred and twenty feet above their heads.

“This monument is sculptured out of an enormous and compact block of freestone, slightly tinged with oxyde of iron. Its preservation is due to the protection which the adjacent rocks and upper vault afford it against the winds and rains. The statues and the bases of the columns alone exhibit signs of deterioration, caused by humidity, which corrodes the parts that are most in relief, or are nearest to the earth. It is to this influence we are to attribute the fall of one of the columns, which was attached to the pediment; it would have drawn down with it the whole monument if it had been built, and not hollowed out from the rock. Hence only a void has been occasioned, which does not impair the general effect. The prostrate fragments were rather useful to us in their fallen state, inasmuch as they enabled us by the dimensions of the shaft and capital to ascertain the probable height of the column, which we could not otherwise have fixed with any precision.

“On beholding so splendid a front, we expected that the interior would correspond with it in every respect; but we were disappointed. Some steps lead to a chamber, the door of which is seen under the peristyle: although regularly chiselled and in good proportion, the walls are rough; the doors have no frame work; the whole, in fact, seems to have been abandoned as soon as it was executed. There are two lateral chambers; one of which, to the left, is irregularly formed; the other presents two hollows, which appear to have been intended for two coffins, perhaps those of the founders of the monument, which were placed provisionally in this little rock, until the more magnificent receptacle, which they had in their vanity intended for themselves, should be completed.”—p. 170—172.

Such is the wonderful Khasné, than which, say Irby and Mangles, there is scarcely a building of forty years' standing in

England, so well preserved in the greater part of its architectural decorations. One thing further we have to remark relating to it, in the words of the above-named travellers. "The half pediments, which terminate the wings of the building, are finished at the top with eagles, which, combined with a style of architecture differing little from the Roman, can leave no doubt that this great effort of art is posterior to the time of Trajan's conquest." This remark will bear upon something presently to be mentioned. We extract next what relates to the theatre, where, by the bye, we cannot help observing, as indeed we have done throughout, a remarkable similarity of description between M. Léon de Laborde, and Irby and Mangles, so remarkable as to induce us to think the French traveller much indebted to our English ones.

"The brook of Wady Mousa, turning to the right, that is to say, to the south, enters a ravine, which gradually narrows, as we advance through it. Excavations, not indeed of the most elegant description, but numerous beyond calculation, here present themselves on all sides. The excavation, however, that most excited our attention, was a vast theatre in the bosom of the mountain, surmounted, and in some degree sheltered, by the rocks. To scoop out a theatre in the side of a mountain seems to be an enterprize of infinite labour; but to form it thus from a rocky substance is an enterprize still more astonishing. The benches, though worn by use and by the waters which run over them from the heights, are pretty well preserved, and permit an accurate plan to be taken of the interior. The situation of the stage may be easily ascertained: and we saw also several bases of columns, the original position of which it was not difficult to conjecture. But what surprised us most was the selection of such a spot* for a place of amusement, considering the prospect it afforded on all sides of death and its mansions, which touch the very sides of the theatre. What a strange habit of mind the people of Petra must have possessed, thus to familiarize themselves so constantly to the idea of death, as Mithridates accustomed himself to poison in order to render himself insensible to its effects!"—p. 163.

What next follows relates to the plate, and to a tomb behind an adjoining mass of rocks.

"M. Linant took the same view from a greater distance, by ascending the ravine. I have endeavoured to preserve in this design the character of the original, although it differs from the preceding view in some points. Funereal monuments are seen on all sides decorating the rocks from the base to the summit. On the left hand, steps are cut in a ravine which lead to a fortress, and to other tombs. As an excursion to them

* It calls to our minds the Greek Epigram—

Συνη πᾶς ὁ βίος, καὶ παίγνιον ἡ μάθη παιζειν
τὴν σπουδὴν μεταθείς, ἢ φέρε τὰς ὀδύνας.

What is said by Irby and Mangles is quoted in the Translation, p. 428, of their work.

would take us to a distance from the Fellahs, we felt no difficulty in postponing it to another day.

"Behind the mass of rocks which are seen to the right, there is a tomb that may be considered as a model of the style which chiefly prevails among the monuments at Petra. I shall not here undertake to settle the points of resemblance which might determine the architectural style: it will be sufficient to exhibit this tomb (*see plate*) as a type of those monuments, and they are by far the most numerous, which do not owe their origin to the domination or the taste of the Romans."—pp. 163, 164.

But we find it impossible without the aid of plates, to give any adequate description of this excavated necropolis—we must therefore refer the reader to the work itself, and conclude what more immediately relates to its former magnificence with the account of El Deir, or the Convent, and with the travellers' departure:

"To finish our examination of the valley, we had still to pursue our researches in the north-west, the west, and the south. Our guides conducted us at first to the north, by a ravine which at the opening was wide, and planted with magnificent laurels; it soon, however, became narrow, and was encumbered by rocks of enormous size. We should have found it impossible to go on, had it not been for the footways we discovered at every step, wrought by the indefatigable industry of the ancient inhabitants. Nothing appeared to them too laborious that was calculated to facilitate access to the splendid funereal monuments which they found* near the summits of the mountains. Roads sufficiently wide were cut in the rocks, cascades were divested of their ruggedness, and a superb staircase extended over a space of more than fifteen hundred feet, in order to lead to the great tomb, which the Arabs call El Deir, or the Convent.

"No traveller had yet approached this monument. Burckhardt appears to have known nothing of it. Mr. Banks and his friends were unable to visit it, and were obliged to content themselves with having seen it at the distance of half a league through a telescope.† We were therefore the first to explore this astonishing work of art.

"Sculptured in relief on the rock, it exhibits a compact mass, a monolithic monument, in fact, of enormous dimensions, by way of ornament, in front of the mountain. Its preservation is perfect; it would be difficult to say as much for its style. The vastness of its dimensions, however, compensate in some degree for its defects; and even the fantastic character which it presents is curious with reference to the history of the arts, when compared with the different edifices which were constructed about the time of their revival. It forms a link between their decline in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and their restoration in the fifteenth. Upon examination, one would be inclined to conclude

* So it stands in the translation. But, can it be correct?—As we said above, we greatly regret that the original work could not be consulted by us. Why we do so may be further collected from pp. 178, 189, 319,—if the latter reference belongs to the original, and is not an addition.

† Irby and Mangles, p. 438.

that the projectors of this work, inspired by a purer taste than belonged to their age, had recourse not indeed to the fountain head of the arts, nor even to the beauties of some of the monuments which they might have found at home, and which might have served them as models, but only to that stage at which the architects went astray from the true and only path that conducted to perfection. Hence they made but half a step towards it, taking the scale of the art, not from its highest, but from its lowest degree; thus returning towards purity of style through the same gradations by which it had descended at the period of its decline.

“While I was copying this grand architectural production, M. Linant took its measurements; we then examined its environs. In front of it there is a lofty rock, to which an artificial ascent is formed; we found on the top, on a level platform, a line of columns, the bases of which are still in their places, and a subterraneous chamber, at the bottom of which there is a niche, sculptured with great care, though in an extremely defective style. From this platform we enjoyed a most extensive view; the eye commanding on one side, the monument of El Deir and the valley of Mousa, and on the other, the chaos of rocks which are piled at the foot of Mount Hor.”—p. 181—183.

After having finished their observations, and after a residence amongst the ruins of eight days, (Irby and Mangles were only there for two, and Burckhardt, we think, but for one,) the travellers prepared to depart: and M. de Laborde apologizes for the sameness of his drawings and descriptions in the following words:

“If my object were simply to exhibit the most eminent of the objects which attracted our attention during our expedition, I should have felt a pleasure in selecting from the innumerable monuments of Petra those only which by their style were calculated to gratify the admirers of the beautiful; but I thought it right, during a tour through Arabia Petræa, and especially through its capital, which formed the great object of our journey, to present a series of monuments in different styles, dating from different epochs.

“I pass over the difficulties we experienced during our sojourn in the valley, which we protracted in spite of warnings from some of the Fellahs, and menaces from others, who, besides the sinister intentions they openly avowed, threatened us with the contagion. Our Arabs, terrified with the idea of the plague, and moreover not finding amongst these ruins anything of that interest which they had for us, seemed to be of opinion that they had amply fulfilled their engagements by having enabled us to make a stay of eight days in the valley. They then declared that it was time to go away; and we consented, on reflecting that we had accurately surveyed this great labyrinth of ruins, and that to make any further delay would only endanger our acquisitions, and injure, by abusing it, the authority we had still preserved over our guides.

“The camels having accordingly been assembled around our funereal habitation,* they were loaded; and the whole of this strange caravan of curious travellers, who had encamped for eight days in the mystic valley

* The travellers had taken up their lodgings within a tomb. See p. 156. “We searched among this multitude of tombs, now open to every visiter, for one which

of tombs, departed furtively in the evening, apprehensive, as it were, of disturbing the silence which dwelt among them. The isolated column projected its shadow to a distance, and we had scarcely reached the top of the ravine, when the sun was gilding, with his last rays, the higher rocks, and their singular ornaments. By degrees the ruins were concealed in the increasing shade, then the more elevated monuments, and their more prominent points, until the whole disappeared in the darkness of night, leaving behind them that painful impression of melancholy on our minds, which is always felt at the moment when a sublime spectacle vanishes from the view."—pp. 189, 190.

With this we conclude our extracts relative to Petra. We have, however, yet a few words to say relative to the prophecies concerning Edom, which, from the words of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, might perhaps point to an earlier accomplishment than we see to have been the case. This, nevertheless, is but a seeming difficulty, as to the careful reader of Holy Writ it will at once be evident that it is the final destruction of the land,—the swallowing up of the Edomitish name,—the utter dissolution of its polity, which is intended in the strong expressions we have already laid before our readers. Accordingly, when we read in M. de Laborde of tombs with a Greek inscription * on them, we are not at all surprised, nor yet at such a passage as the following: "We found here a Latin inscription in three lines, carved on a tablet, the *only* (?) inscription we discovered at Petra. It is of importance, as it gives the name of the officer, Quintus Prætextus Florentinus, who died in this capital while he was governor of this part of Arabia. It appears to be of the time of Adrian, or of Antoninus Pius."† We say, that we are not at all surprised at such accounts as these; because we collect a good deal concerning Petra from profane authors; and, when we sift the Scriptures, find also that it should be built and again thrown down. In fact, the early tombs and the later ones,—the early buildings and the later ones—the *line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness*, whether ancient, or, comparatively speaking, modern as the days of Trajan and Adrian,—one and all do but declare the truth that Esau was hated, and his mountains and his heritage laid waste for the dragons of the wilderness. Nay, more, the words of the prophet Malachi which follow, connected with these recent discoveries and the history of the Nabathæi in Strabo and elsewhere, one might afford us a convenient place of residence. We had thus before us a complete picture of life: a journey—its halting place, the grave." Below, p. 188, speaking of that unique tomb internally ornamented, M. Laborde says, "When the Fellahs descend into the valley, this tomb which is easily closed, serves as a stable for their herds. Such are the uses to which these costly monuments of human vanity have been converted!"

* This inscription unfortunately has not been deciphered—though, M. de Laborde says, he has laid it before "several enlightened Hellenists."

† P. 179, 180. We have not been able to find out anything concerning Quintus Prætextus Florentinus. Possibly we might, had we access to a good library.

would think were sufficient to turn the heart of the veriest sceptic in the world to that wisdom which is justified of all her children.* WHEREAS EDMOND SAITH, WE ARE IMPOVERISHED, BUT WE WILL RETURN AND BUILD THE DESOLATE PLACES; THUS SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS, THEY SHALL BUILD, BUT I WILL THROW DOWN; AND THEY SHALL CALL THEM, THE BORDER OF WICKEDNESS, AND, THE PEOPLE AGAINST WHOM THE LORD HATH INDIGNATION FOR EVER. AND YOUR EYES SHALL SEE AND YE SHALL SAY, THE LORD WILL BE MAGNIFIED FROM THE BORDER OF ISRAEL. The truth is, that *prophecy is of no private interpretation*; and this prophecy has been and is fulfilled publicly and openly to our eyes as concerns Edom. And the following note of Dean Prideaux, in his *Connection of the History of the Old and New Testament*, on the verses of Malachi above quoted, is perfectly true, though not quite in the sense which he intended it; for Petra was at that time hid in its rocky covert, and its desolation was not laid open, as it is now, to bear witness to the Spirit of Prophecy. "Thus God speaks, v. 3, of his having laid the mountains and heritage of Esau waste, which was done on their expulsion by the Nabathæans out of the mountainous country lying between the Red Sea and the Lake of Sodom, where they formerly had their inheritance. The 4th verse contains their brag, that they would return again into this their ancient country, rebuild the desolated cities, which they formerly there possessed, and again dwell in them. But hereto God, by the mouth of his holy prophet, denies them success; and so it accordingly happened: for the Edomites could never again recover that country."†

Farther than this we have not space to follow up the history of Edom, and the Nabathæi; but a good deal of it will be found by the reader in this volume. We give, however, two short extracts from Reland, as they may be of use to those who are fond of numismatic and ecclesiastical research. "Petra erat Arabiæ metropolis, quo spectant nummi, in quibus ADPIANH ΠΕΤΡΑ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙC‡ legitur: nam et Hadriana dicta est, imperante Trajano à Palma præfecto Syriæ Romanis subjecta, teste Dione." And two pages after; "Petrae episcopi in actis conciliorum memorantur Germanus, qui conciliabulo Seleuciensi interfuit anno 539, et Theodorus, qui interfuit concilio Hierosolymitano, anno 536. Uterque scribit se episcopum Περῶν, nam et Περαι et Περὰ scribitur nomen hujus urbis."§

We dismiss this part of our subject, and of the book before us, in the words of old Fuller. The passage is from his description

* Malachi, c. i. v. 15.

† See Part ii. book iii. vol. iii. p. 269, note. Ed. Clar. 1820.

‡ So Strabo, lib. xvi. c. iv. μητρόπολις δὲ τῶν Ναβαταίων ἐστὶν ἡ Πέτρα καλεμένη.

§ Reland ut suprâ, pp. 931, 933.

of Edom in his Pisgah-Sight of Palestine. "So much for Edom, whose ancient antipathy against Israel continued and increased to the last witness, *their standing in the cross ways to cut off them of Judah which should escape, and shut up the remnant in the day of affliction.* God in conclusion was even with them: for as they *had cast lots upon Jerusalem,* so at last, they drew such a *blank* for themselves, that notwithstanding their *eagle's nests* and starry dwellings (wherein they placed their confidence), they were brought to destruction, their high habitations being so far from saving them, that they only contributed to make their fall more visible to others and dangerous to themselves."

Having done with Petra, the rest of the space we can allot to the translation of M. de Laborde will be filled with more various extracts. We give the following, as it enables us to premise that the *fiery serpents* of the Pentateuch are still abundant at the "ascent of Akrabbim" (Numb. xxxiv. 4); called, as Bochart supposes, from the number of scorpions found there. The word "fiery" is probably, as M. de Laborde observes, metaphorical, and applied from the burning effect of their bites. So in the LXX. translation of Deut. viii. 15, we find ὄφεις δάκνων καὶ σκόρπιος. Numb. xxi. 6. ὄφεις τὴς θανατῆντας, καὶ ἔδακνον τὸν λαόν. The passage alluded to is this,—and the place, to the south of the Dead Sea, where the Israelites suffered from them.

"The night passed quietly over, and the cold of the morning had warned us to rise, when we found beneath the carpet which formed our bed, a large scorpion of a yellow colour, and three inches in length. When he was detected, he endeavoured to effect his escape, though not with a rapidity sufficient to ensure his safety: but our Arabs did not wish that he should be killed. I had already observed on other occasions, a singular feeling of benevolence amongst these people; but I did not imagine that it extended to such obnoxious animals. It is remarkable, that a religion, fraught with enthusiasm, founded by the force of arms, by conquest and the effusion of blood, and which maintains itself by its fanatical and warlike spirit, should have adopted and preserved principles of so much amenity. In a country where the life of man weighs so lightly in the scale of power, one is astonished to meet with so much tenderness towards the inferior animals, even those which religion proscribes, or which are troublesome, and sometimes dangerous from their habits of attacking every thing that comes in their way. *The Alaouins told us that scorpions and serpents abound in this part of the desert.*"*—pp. 137, 138.

The following somewhat lengthy extract is given, because it bears testimony to the former celebrity and comparative cultivation of parts now utterly desolate. Now that the rose of Sharon has shed her leaves, and nothing but thorns are left, Edom might

* We have caused these words to be printed in italics, as bearing reference to the words of the Bible.

well say, "*call me not Naomi, call me Mara, for the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me.*"*

"Our course led over the ridges of these mountains," (which separate Arabia Petræa from Arabia Deserta,) "having on our left, at an enormous depth below, the bottom of a valley, where the stones which were loosened by the tread of our animals resounded as they fell into the abyss. The country became more elevated as we advanced, and was, for the most (part?), covered with a fertile soil. The herbage, increasing on all sides, indicated at every step, the possibility of cultivation; of which, indeed, we observed some traces in heaps of small stones, which we found collected at intervals, and which seemed intended to mark the boundaries of fields. These tokens of industry may have belonged to that remote age when Nabathæan agriculture flourished; a period too distant to be vaunted of in the Arabian authors. We stopped at the well of Dalege; at a short distance we found the ruins of a village, the inhabitants of which, doubtless, succeeded in cultivating its environs at the time when the supply of the markets of Petra offered the opportunities of profit. The next day, proceeding towards the east, we reached the highest point of the mountain, which commands, on one side, the entire mass of rocks descending in the direction of Wady Araba; on the other, the great plain of Arabia Deserta, which extends, apparently without any limits, towards Persia. What particularly strikes one at the first moment is, the difference in the level on the two sides of the mountain; the one sinking rapidly into deep and rough ravines,—the other spreading around into a uniform plain almost of the same height as the mountain itself.

"We observed, on the summit, very distinct traces of an ancient road, which extends from the north-east to the south-west; or, rather, from Petra to Akaba. This was the ancient line of commercial intercourse from the Red Sea and Aila, the great entrepôt of Petra. Afterwards it was frequented by the Mussulmen on their way to Mecca, when Akaba was the rendezvous of the two great caravans; one from Gharb,† or Africa, the other from the north. Aboudjazi was the first to give me this information; it was confirmed by the ruins of villages, forts, and cisterns, which were constructed principally for the use of travellers.

"On the declivity of the mountain we perceived other ruins of villages, which afford traces of having been inhabited at no remote period. Our guides told us that many such ruins were to be found in that direction. An abundant spring and a reservoir near it, poured their waters over the plain, and served to irrigate the spots cultivated by the Fellahs. The wonderful fertility of these rare patches of earth, in the midst of a sterile country, seemed intended to remind us that one day that region had been happy, when a powerful hand had not weighed upon it.

* Ruth, i. 20. See Fuller's Pisgah-Sight of Palestine.

† That, is, we suppose, the west, for so "Gharb" means in Arabic. Hence the name "*Algarve*" given to the south of Portugal by the Moors, and still retained. Africa lying to the west of the ancient land of Edom would be called *Gharb* by the Arabs, just as Italy was called *Hesperia* by the Greeks.

"Est locus, *Hesperiam* Græci cognomine dicunt."

"There is to be found at Kerak a species of bearded wheat, that justifies the text of the Bible* against the charges of exaggeration of which it has been the object ; and the vines also, of this country, of the fruit of which we saw some specimens, account for the enormous grapes which the spies sent out by Moses brought back from the places they had visited. (See Plate.) At the present day, in this land of malediction, nothing but the extreme misery of the inhabitants could urge them to cultivate the earth with such persevering industry as they do, seeing the many annoyances to which they are subject. First come the Bedouins, a rapacious race, who are ever claiming from the poor agriculturist a portion of his produce, under the pretext of a lawful impost, in return for precarious protection, a most unjust demand, but exacted with too much authority to be resisted. Next appears the locust ; who, despising the idea of an impost, approaches with his troop, and lays waste the whole country, spreading, as it were, the winding-sheet of death over every tract on which he lights.—Joel, ii."—p. 202—204.

The Idumean palm trees have been celebrated in all ages, and have served to adorn the verse of Virgil, Lucan, Statius, and other poets. The one here described grew naturally—*facundis jugis Idumes*.

"I could not, at the same time, pass over without notice a palm tree in its natural state, which we found in the upper part of Wadeh Seleh. We always represent the trunk of a palm tree shooting up to some distance, and then suffering its crooked branches to spring forth, from which gracefully hang the dates as brilliant as corals ; never thinking that all this elegance is the effect of art, and that nature, less studied in her attitudes, attends only to the preservation of the tree. The above wood cut (see work) exhibits a palm, such as it may be found in a wild state ; growing larger from year to year, making for itself a rampart of its decayed branches, and rising, as it were, perpetually from its own ruins. Neglected by the Arab of the desert, who considers every kind of cultivation as beneath his dignity, the palm sometimes forms impenetrable forests.† More frequently, however, it is found in a solitary state, near a spring, as the design shows it ; thus presenting to the thirsty traveller a welcome signal, which assures him of water for refreshment, and of a friendly shade for repose."—p. 227.

But as the title of the work before us speaks of a journey to Mount Sinai, it will be necessary for us now to say something of his "grey top" and of the convent of St. Catherine. Part of it will be in the words of the translation, part in the words of Burckhardt, because his narrative is clearer and more explicit. Laborde says :

"Continuing our course towards the north, we arrived within sight of

* Cf. Gen. xli. 5. "Rank" in the LXX. is rendered *καλαμίσκος*. A drawing of the Heshbon wheat is given in Irby and Mangles, p. 472.

† We wish M. de Laborde had mentioned the locality of such forests. We do not call to mind the description of one in any traveller.

Sinai, by a series of valleys which expand or become narrow according to their composition and the rapidity of the currents that flow through them. After passing a considerable ridge of the mountain which forms the two grand outlets of the Peninsula, (one, that of Wady Cbeick, which takes its course with Feeran into the Gulf of Suez, the other that of Zackal, which descends towards the Gulf of Akaba,) we perceived the convent of St. Catherine, standing silently in the midst of the majestic mountains by which it is commanded. On the left rises Mount Horeb, a prolongation of Sinai; and in the distance extends the plain where the people of Israel encamped on their journey through the wilderness.'—pp. 228, 229.

The description of the convent which follows is in the words of Burckhardt. They are quoted in the translation.

“The convent of Mount Sinai is situated in a valley so narrow, that one part of the building stands on the western mountain, while a space of twenty paces only is left between its walls and the eastern mountain. The valley is open to the north, from whence approaches the road from Cairo; to the south, close behind the convent, it is shut up by a third mountain, less steep than the others, over which passes the road to Sheron. The convent is an irregular quadrangle of about one hundred and thirty paces, enclosed by high and solid walls, built with blocks of granite, and fortified by several small towers. While the French were in Egypt, a part of the east wall, which had fallen down, was completely rebuilt by the order of General Kleber, who sent workmen here for that purpose. The upper part of the walls in the interior is built of a mixture of granite, sand, and gravel, cemented together by mud, which has acquired great hardness. The convent contains eight or ten small court yards, some of which are neatly laid out in beds of flowers and vegetables; a few date trees and cypresses also grow there, and great numbers of vines. The distribution of the interior is very irregular, and could not be otherwise, considering the slope upon which the building stands; but the whole is very clean and neat. There are a greater number of small rooms in the lower and upper stories which are at present unoccupied. The principal building in the interior is the great church, which, as well as the convent, was built by the Emperor Justinian, but it has subsequently undergone frequent repairs. The form of the church is an oblong square; the roof is supported by a double row of five granite pillars, which have been covered by a coat of white plaster, perhaps because the natural colour of the stone was not agreeable to the monks, who saw granite on every side of them. The capitals of the columns are of different designs; several of them bear a resemblance to palm branches, while others a close but coarse imitation of the latest period of Egyptian sculpture, such as is seen at Philæ,* and in several temples in Nubia. The dome over the altar still remains as it was constructed by Justinian, whose portrait, together with that of his wife Theodora, may

* See Burckhardt himself, who calls Philæ “Giesiret El Berbe El Ghassis,” or “The Island of ruined Temples;” and Irby and Mangles, p. 106, “Philæ is the easternmost of a group of islands and rocks which compose the first cataract.”

yet be distinguished on the dome together with a large picture of the transfiguration, in honour of which event the convent was erected. An abundance of silver lamps, paintings, and portraits of saints adorn the walls round the altar; among the latter is St. Christopher with a dog's head. The floor of the church is finely paved with slabs of marble.

"The church contains the coffin in which the bones of St. Catherine were collected from the neighbouring Mountain of St. Catherine, where her corpse was transported after her death by the angels in the service of the monks. The silver lid of a sarcophagus attracts attention; upon it is represented at full length the figure of the Empress Anne of Russia, who entertained the idea of being interred in the sarcophagus, which she sent here; but the monks were disappointed of this honour. In a small chapel adjoining the church is shown the place where the Lord is supposed to have appeared to Moses in the burning bush; it is called Alyka, and is considered as the most holy spot in Mount Sinai. Besides the great church, there are twenty-seven smaller churches or chapels dispersed over the convent, in many of which daily masses are read, and in all of them at least one every Sunday.

"The convent formerly resembled in its establishment that of the Holy Sepulchre* at Jerusalem, which contains churches of various sects of Christians. Every principal sect, except the Calvinists and Protestants, has its churches in the convent of Sinai. I was shown the chapels belonging to the Syrians, Armenians, Copts, and Latins, but they have long been abandoned by their owners. The church of the Latins fell into ruins at the close of the seventeenth century, and has not been rebuilt. But what is more remarkable than the existence of so many churches, is, that, close by the great church, stands a Mahometan mosque, spacious enough to contain 200 people at prayers. The monks told me that it was built in the sixteenth century, to prevent the destruction of the convent."—*Burckhardt*, p. 541—543.

We fill up what is wanting to complete this description from M. de Laborde.

"The church of the convent deserves particular attention on account of the style of its ornaments, and more especially the fine mosaic which embellishes the vault, beneath which the relics of St. Catherine are preserved. It is the narrowest part of the church, and the lamps and tapers, which are continually burning in honour of the saint, have blackened the ceiling with their smoke; and, moreover, the light which comes from them strikes on the eyes and prevents them from distinguishing any of the objects above. I succeeded, however, in making a tolerably correct copy of the mosaic. Moses is represented on the left of two windows, which are seen at the top of the design, on his knees before the burning bush; on the right he receives the tables of the law. In my copy Moses wears a beard, which does not accord with the mosaics and miniatures that have come to us from the East, in which he is generally repre-

* See Thevenot's Travels, part i. c. xxxix. p. 187, of the old English translation, ed. 1687.

sented with youthful features without a beard,* wearing a long blue tunic and a white cloak. The lower part of the vault represents the transfiguration, which was the symbol of the convent. In the middle is Christ; on the right, Elias; on the left, Moses; and at the bottom of the picture, Saints John, Peter, and James, struck with astonishment and dazzled with celestial light. At the top of the vault two medallions contain portraits of the founders of the convent—the Emperor Justinian, and Theodora his consort. The ancient medals and mosaics always represent the Emperor Justinian without a beard; my copy, therefore, is not, perhaps, correct in this respect.† Round the arch are seen the names, in Greek, of several saints, mixed with those of the functionaries of the monastery at the time when the mosaic was executed.

“At the bottom of the niche there is an inscription in Greek, of which the following is a translation:—‘In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *the whole of this work was executed for the salvation of those who have contributed to it by their donations, under Longinus, the most holy priest and prior.*’ Beneath this inscription there are bust portraits, with these legends (?)—Daniel, Jeremy, Malachy, Haggai, Habbacuc, Joel, Amos, David, Hosea, Micah, Abdias, Nahum, Σοφορίας, Zechariah, Isaias, and Ezekiel.”—pp. 234—237.

There is altogether something so strange in this latter extract, that either M. de Laborde, the translator, or the printer, must have been wondrously inaccurate. Why is the word Σοφορίας alone given in Greek? Was it not known to be Zephaniah? That can hardly be, or Ἀμβακὲμ would not have been rendered Habbacuc. Again, why is Abdias (LXX. Ὀβδίας or Ἀβδίας) not translated Obadiah? In more instances than one our suspicions have been roused; but it is only the original work that could set them at rest. We have caused (for reasons easily discernible) a part of the words to be printed in italics. What legends can be in the original, we cannot conjecture.

As everything relating to Mount Sinai must be interesting, we give, as we purposed, the pilgrimage of M. de Laborde:—

“In order to complete my pilgrimage, it was necessary that I should ascend Mount Sinai. None of the monks were disposed to accompany me; they lent me therefore one of their Arabian servants, a sort of Helots among the Bedouins, to be my guide, as well as to carry the provisions which were necessary for this fatiguing journey. I fastened myself to the rope, and the windlass being turned round, I was gently

* We would observe in a note, that the heathen Bacchus has been supposed to be no other than Moses, and that he is called by Lucian ἀγνίστων ἀκριβῶς and ἀγνίστων στρατηλάτην.—Hemsterhus, vol. iii. pp. 76, 78. See a brochure published in Germany, *De Personarum in Euripidis Bacchabus habitu scenico Commentatio*. The second chapter is entitled *De Bacchi Persona*, p. 8. In Euripides he is thus described.

“ξανθοῖσι βοστρυχοῖσιν εὐκροσμος, κόμην
δίνωπός, ὅσσοις χάριτας Ἀφροδίτης ἵχων.”—El. v. 235.

† Is there no reason for the same misgiving as concerns Moses above? *Quære.*

deposited at the foot of the walls. The rope was rapidly drawn up again to assure the poor monks that they were perfectly isolated in the midst of this hostile desert.

“ The window, which is the only entrance,—the cord, which is the only communication with the external world,—gave to the whole of this building a grave and solemn appearance. When I was drawn up by means of this machine, I felt the same impression as if I heard the creak of the hinges of a large door which closes on the visiter who enters through curiosity a state-prison. This peculiarity appears to have existed from the time when the monks were obliged to protect themselves from the repeated hostilities of the surrounding Arabs. Harrant de Polschitz, in 1598, and M. Monconys, in 1647, entered the convent by the great gate : but the superior of the Franciscans, in 1722, was hoisted through the window. Sandy (*Sandys* ?) who, in 1610, entered by the iron-door, speaks also of a window, through which the alms were usually dispensed to the Arabs : it is probable* that, towards the end of the seventeenth century, the latter had forced the gate, and that from that period the window before appropriated to alms was used for the admission of strangers.

“ Mount Horeb forms a kind of breast from which Sinai rises. The former alone is seen from the valley, which accounts for the appearance of the burning bush on that mountain and not on Sinai.† *Exod. iii. 1, 2.* Our course towards the summit of Sinai lay through a ravine to the south-west. The monks had arranged a series of large slabs in tolerably regular order, which once formed a convenient staircase to the top of the mountain. The rains, however, have disturbed them, and, as no repairs had been for a long time attended to, the stairs were in many places in ruins. Just before reaching the foot of Sinai, immediately after quitting Horeb, the traveller sees a door built in the form of an arch ; on the key-stone of the arch a cross has been carved. A tradition, preserved by the monks, and repeated by many pilgrims, informs us, that a Jew, being desirous of ascending Mount Sinai, was stopped by an iron crucifix, which prevented him from pursuing his way ; and that, to remove the enchantment, he had himself baptized at the head of the stream which runs into the ravine. An affecting custom used to take place near this door ; one of the monks of the convent employed himself there at prayer, and heard the confessions of the pilgrims, who, when thus nearly at the end of their pilgrimage, were not in the habit of accomplishing it until after they had obtained absolution.

* The whole account may be seen in Thevenot, Part I. c. xxviii. xxix. p. 169—170. For a while, it appears, the monks, to punish the Arabs, deserted the convent, and hence, says Thevenot, “ we found so many monks in the monasteries of *Tor*.

† We have given the text as it stands,—whether the comment be required we leave for others to judge. Those who imagine they detect the Indian and heathen Bacchus in the Moses of the Bible of course refer all those fiery appearances mentioned in the Greek poets to this passage of the Exodus. Elmsley has collected most of the passages alluded to on these verses of the *Bacchæ* of Euripides.

ἔτ' αὐτὸν ὄψει καπὶ Δελφίσι πέτραις
πηδῶντα σὺν πύκαισι δικάρυον πλάκα, κ. τ. ε. ν. 506.

" We passed another similar door before arriving at a small level spot, whence we discovered the summit of Sinai, and the two edifices which surmount it. The nearest building is the chapel of the convent, the further one is the mosque. In the distance of the design is seen the chapel of Elias in ruins, and in the foreground the fountain and the cypress, which give some degree of animation to these rocks, whose grandeur is entirely lost by being compressed within so limited a space. The superior of the Franciscans found two cypresses and three olive-trees in this place, but the cypress alone still survives.

" We climbed with difficulty to the top of Sinai, resting at each cleft or salient(?) part of the rock to which some traditions have been annexed by the inventive faculty of the monks, who have communicated them to the Arabs, always ready to listen to narratives of this description. Arrived on the summit, I was surprised by the briskness of the air. The eye sought in vain to catch some prominent object amid the chaos of rocks which were tumbled round the base, and vanished in the distance in the form of raging waves. Nevertheless, I distinguished the Red Sea, the mountains of Africa, and some summits of mountains which I easily recognized by their shapes;—Schommar being distinguishable by its rounded masses, Serbul by its shooting points, and Tih by its immense prolongation.

" I visited the ruins of the mosque and of the Christian church, both of which rebuke, on this grand theatre of the three religions that divide the world, the indifference of mankind to the creeds which they once professed with so much ardour." *A timely rebuke if intended as we understand it.*

" In the time of Frescobaldi (1384) the chapel was embellished with paintings, and closed by an iron-door; when Peter Belon visited it in 1550, and subsequently Pölschitz in 1598, the door was still in existence; but the pilgrims had already covered the walls with their names and those reflections which travellers are every where accustomed to leave behind them. In 1610 Sandys found it deserted and in ruins.

" Descending by the ravine which separates Sinai from Mount St. Catharine, we found, amidst numerous traces of the veneration formerly paid to all these places, the stone from which Moses caused water to spring forth by the command of God. *Exod. xvii. 1—6.**

" On returning to Cairo I took a different route from that which I had followed when going to Akaba. I visited Djebel Serbal, a lofty mountain of granite, which conceals in its deep valleys many ruins of convents, deserted gardens, and staircases constructed with wondrous perseverance, in order to afford to the pilgrim every means for facilitating his pious enterprize.

" This ravine placed out of the course usually taken by travellers and pilgrims, has necessarily escaped their examination. It deserves, however, to be visited, even at the risk of all the fatigue with which such a

* Thevenot mentions the same stone, Part I. c. xxvi. p. 167. So also Sir F. Heniker, whose words are quoted by the translator, p. 243.

journey would be attended, although the traveller had no other object in view than to admire those magnificent rocks, the profound silence that reigns amongst them, and the ruins of those modest hermitages which remind us of the ages when religious enthusiasm led pilgrims far from their native land, and a pious resignation taught them to live happily, or at least tranquilly, in the midst of this vast solitude."—p. 238—246.*

With this long quotation we end our extracts from this volume, not having space to quote at length the account of the Sinaite inscriptions in the Wady Mokatleb. What relates to them will be found in p. 248—253. They are obviously of great antiquity, but the researches of philologists and antiquarians have not hitherto determined their date. "The most general opinion, however," says M. de Laborde, "is, that they were the work of pilgrims who visited Sinai about the sixth century." Of the hundred and eighty-seven inscriptions published by Mr. Grey, which he copied, in 1820, in Wady Mokatleb, and its environs, nine are Greek and one Latin. On the whole, the work is one which cannot fail to be deeply interesting, more particularly in what relates to Petra and the prophecies concerning Edom. If our suspicions have been sometimes roused, and if we have occasionally noted the translation as defective, and not the work of any very cunning hand, we have nevertheless been highly gratified with what was before unknown to us, and are rejoiced to thank as well M. de Laborde as his translator. We have now only to repeat that the work is most beautifully got up. It is an ornament and a praise to the British press, and is fit to be put on the same shelf with the elegant edition of Rogers, and with any other of those luxurious editions of authors, living or dead, which are without any doubt one of the most harmless species of luxury. *Hactenus indulsisse vacat.*

* The following deserves to be noted: "I trust that the efforts which I constantly made to procure a good reception everywhere for Europeans attempting the same journey may be productive of the best effects. This is a duty which no traveller ought ever to forget," p. 213.

ART. XI.—*Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Dublin and Glandelagh, at the Visitation in 1836. To which is added an Address to the Clergy on the close of the Confirmation held at the same time.* By Richard Whately, D.D. Archbishop of Dublin. Dublin : Milliken and Son, Grafton-street. London : B. Fellowes, Ludgate-street. 1836.

THIS is not a charge about the position of the Establishment, or about tithes, or about ecclesiastical discipline; but it is mainly a theological charge. The address, too, which is appended to it, is mainly a theological address. So far we rejoice. The Archbishop of Dublin puts himself fairly forward as a guide to the subordinate and younger clergy with respect to their doctrines, their studies, their mode of teaching and exhorting. Here, whether Dr. Whately be or be not the safest of guides, is perhaps a disputable question; but it is not the question which we now mean to discuss. The point on which we would speak is the propriety that the prelates of the Church should, under its present circumstances, furnish with readiness and plainness their theological as well as general guidance. The task, we can well conceive, must be in many cases irksome, difficult, invidious and painful; but yet, if the Establishment is ever to know internal peace, it must be done. We do not wonder that the prelates should for the most part avoid rather than seek all controverted tenets; that they should strive to hold themselves aloof from the differences of opinion known to exist within the circle of their dioceses; should, in a word, endeavour to be on neither side, or on both sides, and so to surround themselves with an atmosphere of comparative calm, above the strifes and storms which may be disturbing the lower regions of the Establishment. It is moreover, of course to be expected, that the Archbishops and Bishops should allow the same latitude of doctrine which is allowed by the Articles; that they, the executive officers and chief administrators of a church, should not impose restrictions more narrow than the basis of its constitution; should not insist upon a degree of uniformity, neither enforced by the fundamental laws of the religious communion, nor compatible with the myriad diversities of taste, knowledge, mental capacity, practical habits, and early associations. Still it does appear to us to be inconsistent with the dignity of their station, and eventually with the comfort of their lives, that they should assume a neutral position. They are the appointed arbiters and mediators of clerical discussions, whenever there may arise a "*dignus vindice nodus*." Their view or interpretation of any difficult or contested matter must be of essential

service in soothing, or preventing, or adjusting disagreements. The clergy look up to them for advice, and would be glad to rest upon it; they desire that the sentiments of their bishops should be a direction for their own. The prelates, too, we have a thorough conviction, must exert their efforts to restore general harmony, if they hope long to enjoy individual repose. And sure we are, that the mild sceptre of a courteous authority, the impressive weight, and yet the even moderation of Episcopal interference, would at least temper and restrain the excesses of controversy, would at least disarm the hot-headed partisans, into whose hands the warfare of opinion too usually falls, of half the weapons of their craft; would at least curb the violence of excitement and irritation with which they are too often disposed to fling invectives, instead of arguments, at each other.

Dr. Whately, it is possible, takes the field, now and then, too much in the spirit of an individual polemic;—not that he ever descends from a decorous and official gravity, not that he is ever betrayed into malice or bitterness; but that his words sometimes sound more like a challenge to fair combat than an award between the combatants; and that he sometimes seems prepared to contend rather than arbitrate. Still, although we might perhaps respectfully venture, if it became us, to differ from two or three of his conclusions, we are really grateful to his Grace for the frankness and decision with which he delivers them. “Here,” we might say, if we were among the number of his clergy, “here are the expressed sentiments of our archbishop, which may serve as an instruction, without being a dictation.”

But there is the additional advantage that Dr. Whately, besides being one of the frankest, is also one of the clearest of our living writers. This clearness, like the same quality, wherever it exists in composition to any eminent degree, has a three-fold origin, namely, in sagacity of understanding, candour of intention, and moral courage or intrepidity of spirit. Without the combination of these three requisites, let no man suppose that he can write clearly or well upon any of those momentous subjects which intensely engage the feelings, and profoundly affect the interests of mankind. The want of any one of them will vitiate the style, as it impairs the character.

The thoughts of some men are so beclouded, their intellect is so completely in a mist, that their conceptions may be said to float about in an element of colourless vapour, where there is nothing precise in outline or definite in hue. There is no perspicacity in their expressions, for there is none in their minds. They have never ascertained their own sentiments; nay, they have scarcely tried to ascertain them. But it is surely a pity that such

men should put pen to paper for the instruction of others, before they have at all settled and consolidated their own views and intentions.

Other men, again, there are, who are unperspicuous by design. Their deficiency in clearness is a wilful deceit; for their very aim is to mystify and perplex a subject rather than unravel and explain it. But these worthy persons, usually, are caught in their own net, and bewildered in their own mazes. At any rate, they may be safely given up to the contempt and reprobation of all honest minds.

The third class, as we have hinted, is the class of those who labour under a moral, rather than an intellectual defect. They may see their way; but they dare not pursue it. They waver and vacillate; they halt and they start back; because they will not venture to follow up their premisses to the legitimate conclusions. Thus, incapable of a course which is straight-forward in its logic and in its ethics, they fail by the sheer timidity of their disposition; and at last the understanding itself is deplorably enfeebled, because there is no strength of spirit, or decision of will. So that, at one and the same time, the premisses they are unwilling to reconsider, and the conclusions they are afraid to draw. The dread is for ever clinging to them, that such or such an inference is unsafe: that such or such a statement will give offence. And hence over all they say, and all they do, there hangs a vagueness, and a dimness, and an inconsistency, which it is truly painful to contemplate. Such persons may be kindly and conscientious men; but they must not expect to be clear and vigorous writers, useful in their generation. To clearness and vigour of writing, moral force, or energy, is even more indispensable than mental.

Dr. Whately, however, belongs to neither of these classes: but is clear, through his freedom from their defects, much more than from any peculiar neatness in his diction, or any peculiar care or felicity in the arrangement of his matter. And another reason for his perspicuity is, that he discards the use of big words, and fine phrases, and the brilliant obscurity of metaphorical circumlocutions;—content to be plain and idiomatic, and sometimes even blunt, if not always pithy, in his language. Let it be added, that in the present, as in previous publications, a strong impression is ultimately made, rather by the accumulative weight of the statements and arguments, than by the power or splendour of particular expressions.

Reverting, however, for a moment to the subject of clearness in composition, we would remark, that there is a false clearness as well as a true. There is the clearness of superficiality; the clearness of narrow and shallow vision. It is a truth, though it may

seem a paradox, that clearness of notions is oftentimes the *first* thing, at which a man arrives, as well as the *last*. Thus "*clear and consistent views*," as they are denominated in the Christian religion, are with too many, we apprehend, the mere result of the most cursory, partial, and insufficient enquiry. A man, instead of comprehending the length and breadth and depth of a subject, discerns two or three appearances lying on the surface of a very small part of its area; and he rushes to an adjudication as defined and intelligible, as it is rash and precipitate. He is like an unjust or foolish judge, who should hurry to declare some positive and dogmatic sentence, when he had heard a tenth of the case: or a dabbler in geology, who should decide upon the history and constitution of the entire globe by the mould, or even the manure, obviously visible on the top of his own field. He, who will look at but a few fragments of some mighty whole, is at least secure from being bewildered by the multiplicity of considerations: and that man is tolerably sure of being "*clear*," as he calls it, upon a question, who has never penetrated to its mysteries and difficulties. To take a familiar and somewhat low illustration, we might say that the surface is bright, simply because the mud at the bottom has not been stirred. He must make farther researches, before he can even be thrown into the modesty of doubt. He must, perhaps, think, and study, and examine for years, before, in reality; light can arise out of darkness, and clearness out of confusion; or, after all, probably, the only clearness, which he can reach, is a clear perception of the extent, and hopelessness, and necessity of his ignorance.

It is, however, much easier to discriminate so far between the genuine quality, and the counterfeit, than always to distinguish a lucid and easy mode of expressing the sentiments which a man entertains from the clearness and definiteness of the views themselves. But not to involve ourselves in subtleties, which have no special application, Dr. Whately's clearness, we may repeat, is rather that, for the most part, which results from the logical precision of an acute and practised understanding, blended with a firm candour, and perhaps self-confidence, of spirit, than the clearness which sometimes seems to reside in a luminous and transparent beauty of uninvolved style, if style can really be taken apart from thought:—nor is it in every case—for distinctness of belief *may* be separable from completeness of knowledge—a clearness, based upon the best collection of data, or the most extensive and accurate acquaintance with facts. On the whole, Dr. Whately shines more, we think, as a reasoner than an investigator; although it would be unjust to deny to him diligence of scholarship and variety of attainments.

We have ventured these remarks on the characteristics of the Archbishop, instead of criticising in detail the Charge and the Address, which are now before us; because they consist, partly, of a reconstruction or republication of sentiments, which he has already published—for the Archbishop of Dublin, it must be owned, is somewhat fond of quoting Dr. Whately;—and because it is hardly for us to commend where we acquiesce, or attempt to controvert and refute, where we happen to have the misfortune of dissenting from his Grace. We are satisfied, therefore, to give one or two extracts, without farther observation.

The one is from the Charge, and contains a very salutary caution respecting the *tendencies* of certain prevalent opinions.

“As far as *personal* good works are concerned—a *life* pure not only from evil, but from all appearance of evil—this precept belongs to us as *Christians* in common with our brethren among the laity. But in addressing you, my reverend brethren, I have in view more particularly the application of the precept to our *teaching*—to what belongs especially to *us*, as not only members but *ministers* of the Church. We are bound to consider what impression our teaching is likely to make not only on the most attentive and right-minded, and best-instructed hearers, but also on those less considerate, less informed, and less candid. And we should consider also not only what may be truly, but what may be plausibly, urged against the delineation we present of evangelical religion;—prepared, not, of course, to sacrifice to the fear of giving offence anything that really belongs to our religion, but,—for the sake of all parties,—to obviate, as far as possible, any misconceptions of it: not to omit any part of what is good, but to ‘take heed that our good be not evil-spoken of.’

“Let us suppose for instance, that Christianity generally, or our particular view of it, should be charged by the adversaries either of the one or the other, with being an immoral system, and such as ought to be discountenanced by the civil magistrate; on the ground that it tends to lead men to expect divine favour through the correctness of their decision on certain points of belief, and through the strength of their faith in what has been done for them; and to relieve their minds from the reproaches of natural conscience, by a general confession of the universal depravity of human nature, and of the utter worthlessness and vileness of all that men call virtue and righteousness; with a specious acknowledgement indeed, that good works are the proper fruit of faith, but with a sort of practical dispensation (in cases of difficulty and strong temptation) from the bringing forth of those fruits, on account of the frailty and corruption of man’s nature: so that the morality of the Christian religion becomes a thing to be talked of and admired, rather than practised; and men’s only sedulous attention is concentrated on the rectitude of their belief, the confidence of their hopes, and the fervour of their devotions.

“I have given a strong, but by no means an overcharged statement of one kind of objection which has been urged, and *will* be urged, again and

again, by the opponents of evangelical religion, The question for *us* to consider is, not whether *they* are sincere or insincere,—fair or unfair in their imputation : *that* is *their* concern : nor is it sufficient for us to inquire of ourselves whether we are personally immoral in practice or antinomian in creed : that is our concern as *individual Christians* ; but as Christian *ministers* it behoves us to consider whether we are taking due care to guard against a misconstruction of our teaching by the weak and ignorant, which we might have avoided without any compromise of truth. It is for us to consider in all cases not merely whether others are to blame, but whether we are ourselves fairly blameless.”—p. 6—8.

“ If any one, while he dwells continually, and very strongly, (as we certainly ought to do,) on justification by faith, and on the total impossibility of our being able to merit and earn, either wholly, or in part, eternal happiness, by any good works of our own, even should we lead a life of sinless virtue, and on the consequent necessity of renouncing all claims founded on our own righteousness, and of prostrating ourselves in all humility of soul before the cross of Christ ; if, I say, while the Christian is earnestly occupied with these doctrines, and is labouring daily to impress on himself and his hearers the impossibility of our doing anything that can purchase salvation, he is content, at the same time, with a slight occasional hint that this doctrine is not irreconcilable with the moral precepts of Christ and His apostles,—if he is satisfied with just inserting an incidental salvo, by saying, in substance, that notwithstanding the utter worthlessness of our good works, nevertheless, it is to be expected that a sincere Christian will lead a moral life ;—if, I say, this disproportionate inattention be shewn, with respect to the practical ‘ fruits of the Spirit,’ a very great danger will result, of men’s substituting a mere approbation of Christian virtue in the abstract, for the practical exemplification of it in their lives ; a danger that, while they admit, in theory, the obligations of virtue, they will not comply, practically, with the apostle’s direction to ‘ be careful to maintain good works.’

“ It was evidently his design, as well as his blessed Master’s, that Christians should *exert* themselves to ‘ walk worthy of their vocation ;’—should ‘ give *diligence*,’ (as Peter exhorts them,) ‘ to make their calling and election sure ;’—should ‘ *watch*, that they enter not into temptation ;’—should ‘ *run*, that they may obtain ;’—should ‘ *strive* to enter in at the strait gate ;’—should ‘ *work* out their own salvation, with fear and trembling ;’—and ‘ casting aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset us, should run with *patience* the race set before them.’ The apostles expected, not that the Christian should be a *good man notwithstanding* his being justified through faith, but that he should be the *better* man in consequence of his faith ; not only acting on better motives than those who were not Christians, but also acting better,—glorifying his heavenly Father by bringing forth much fruit, and by letting their ‘ light so shine before men, that all might see their good works,’ and thence be led to glorify Him also.

“ But a different kind of teaching from this is often found to be popular, though plain Antinomian teaching is not. There are many who, like Felix, will be ready to ‘ hear you concerning the faith in Christ,’ but

‘when you reason of righteousness, and temperance, and the judgment to come,’ will be alarmed and uneasy, and be disposed to bid you ‘go your way for this time!’ Anything that leads, or that leaves men, without distinctly rejecting Christian virtue, to feel little anxiety and take little pains about it; anything which, though perhaps not so meant, is liable to be so understood, by those who have the wish, as to leave them without any feeling of real shame or mortification or alarm on account of their own faults and moral deficiencies, so as to make them anxiously watchful *only* against seeking salvation by good works, and not at all against seeking salvation *without* good works—all this is likely to be much more acceptable to the corrupt disposition of the natural man, than such teaching as that of our Lord and his apostles.

“But those apostles would have counted it treason to their Master, in themselves, or in us, to be ‘men-pleasers,’ seeking what may be most acceptable to the hearers, rather than most profitable: or shrinking, through fear of unpopularity, from ‘setting before them *all* the counsel of God.’”
—p. 17—20.

The other is from the Address, and contains a caution scarcely less salutary respecting the division of the Bible into Chapter and Verse.

“You should explain, repeatedly, to your hearers, that the division of the Scriptures into chapters and verses is not the work of the sacred writers; and was introduced, in much later times, merely for convenience of reference. Strange as it may seem, there is no inconsiderable number of persons,—even of what are called the educated classes,—who are ignorant of this, and suppose the chapters and verses to be either the divisions made by the authors themselves, or at least, adopted by editors as a natural way of arranging these writings, so as best to exhibit their sense, and separate one branch of a discourse from another; this being the purposed object of any author who *himself* divides a work of his own into chapters or sections. It is true, the most moderate degree of attention will shew, that verses, and even chapters, often conclude in the midst of a discourse,—of an argument,—or even of a sentence. But even such as are the most fully aware of the fact, are often led, by early custom, or by the analogy of chapters, sections and paragraphs in any other book, (which really *are* the divisions intended by the author,) to read the Scriptures with too much reference to these arbitrary divisions, and thus, of course, in many instances, to take, in consequence, a very different view of the sense of the sacred writers. For I need hardly remind you, that the meaning attached to any treatise, depends not merely on the words used, but also on the arrangement and distribution of what is said.

“The evil I have been alluding to, is aggravated in the case of those persons who make a practice, in their private perusal of the Scriptures, of reading the lessons for the day,—the chapters appointed to be publicly read in church,—and confining themselves to this course of study; as if the lessons had been selected with a view to the *private* domestic use of each member of the church. On such a plan, some portions of Scripture, not only

instructive, but needful for the right understanding of other parts, are left unread ; while other portions are read over and over, but often in such an order, or rather such a disorder,—so broken up, disjointed, and thrown together in fragments, that much of what might easily be made intelligible to a reader of ordinary abilities and acquirements, is either very little understood, or, sometimes, most hurtfully misunderstood.

“ Explain to your hearers, therefore,—and, not content with having explained it once for all, *remind* them frequently of, . . . the origin and design of the chapters and verses ; warn them against the mistakes likely to result from reading with reference to them ; and advise them, in their private studies, usually to take up some one book, or considerable portion of a book, and apply themselves to that, at intervals, till they have gone through it. It would be all the better if they were advised not to make a practice of beginning (in each day's reading) at the beginning, or ending at the end, of a chapter ; but to endeavour to counteract the habit of attending to chapters. And every reader of Scripture who seeks for a clear understanding of what he is reading, should be admonished, among other things, always to look back, before he begins any portion, to the part immediately preceding ; which will often be found quite necessary to throw light on what follows.”—p. 64—67.

In conclusion, we cannot but urge once more, seriously and respectfully, the point with which we began. One great source of weakness and disorder—it may soon be disorganization—in the Church, is the internal conflict, concerning both doctrine and discipline, which has long been making its way under ground and half in the dark, but is now struggling, and by degrees mounting, into daylight and importance ; and of which one consequence may be traced in the unbecoming spectacle of ministers preaching against each other, and hearers sitting in judgment upon ministers, and a perpetual reference being made to the arbitration of the review, and the magazine, and the newspaper, upon matters, which ought, if it be possible, to be set at rest by a higher and more authoritative tribunal. If, therefore, it be impracticable, or inexpedient, to convene a general Synod, we do hope, and trust, and most sincerely pray, that the prelates, in their respective dioceses, will afford to their clergy the incalculable advantage of an explicit avowal of their sentiments ; whether in the way of direction, or of admonition, or of simple statement. To recoil from a disagreeable office may be, at last, to sacrifice the entire future to the immediate present ; and to affect blindness may be neither more nor less than to incur the suspicion of strange ignorance or very culpable indifference. They who have been attentive to the aspect of religion, and who are in earnest and solicitous about it, must know, that we are not speaking lightly, or unadvisedly, or without urgent cause. That the dignitaries of the Establishment should attempt to stifle legitimate discussion, or

interfere at all without adequate grounds for their interference, is assuredly no part of our desire. Our belief has been often put on record that controversy upon a subject is a necessary concomitant of imperfect knowledge blended with keen interest; that the only way to procure harmony is by eliciting truth, and the only way to elicit truth is by encouraging the fair and dispassionate advocacy of different opinions. We have contended, moreover, that to think of *curing* an eruption by merely driving it from the surface of the skin to the vital portions of the system, is indeed an awful species of empiricism. On the other hand, however, the glorious work, which, unless we quite misunderstand the indications around us, it is for our bishops to undertake, is not to smother or interdict inquiry, but to lead it by a gentle and gradual, yet felt and acknowledged influence, through a right path to a right goal; and, although they should be unable, after all, to reconcile variations, they may at least, as we have said, correct extravagances, and repress acrimony.

Again and again, we must insist, that one main want among us is a want, not of hasty rashness, but of deliberate explicitness of speech. It matters nothing, how right and wholesome a man's opinions may be, if he shrinks from the avowal of them.

Paulum sepultæ distat inertię
Celata virtus.

Timidity, too, is the great encourager of violence. In this world, and most of all, in these times, a silent undemonstrative wisdom is no match for an active and eloquent, a bold and ardent, folly. Whence we conclude that three things are needed;—first, that men should learn what moderation means, and what it does *not* mean, that they should understand the difference between true moderation and false;—secondly, that they should really be moderate;—and, thirdly, that they should obey the Apostolical precept, “Let your moderation be *known* unto all men.” Most especially, the ecclesiastical condition of the empire calls with a solemn voice upon persons in high station. They might settle disputes by the same expression of sentiments, which, in *us*, would aggravate them. And, if we press this matter too much, it is our very respect for the Episcopal Bench, which may give us the appearance of being disrespectful.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

THE end of the legislative is in some measure the beginning of the ecclesiastical or clerical year. About the month of October many of the clergy are returning to their parochial duties, after the brief interval which they can devote to the pursuit of health, or the indulgence of relaxation: and there is, so to speak, a re-commencement of term. We feel, therefore, that the period affords a very fit opportunity, for taking a rapid survey of the past, the present, and the future; for looking at the principal features in the position and prospects of the establishment, and for examining not merely detached portions of things which must exercise a connected influence, but all which has been done or contemplated *as a whole*. There are some topics, moreover, of the widest and deepest importance in both a religious and national point of view, to the consideration of which we stand pledged; and for contributions upon which we must return our most cordial thanks to the kind friends who have proffered their assistance, and whose suggestions we value the more now, because we have a confident hope of using them hereafter. Measures, again, have been carried through parliament, which must materially affect the clergy of England, both in their incomes and in their authority. There is the Bill for the Commutation of Tithes, from which, in its existing state, they will, for the most part, probably, be immediate gainers, and eventual losers;—losers, we mean, in money, although if the change shall lead to harmony, and the absence of collision, a certain extent of pecuniary sacrifice will cheerfully be borne. The Marriage Bill, and the Bill for the Registration will touch them in two ways,—by the loss of fees, and by the loss of parochial influence: and let us add, that whatever heart-burnings these bills may soothe, and whatever statistical benefits may accrue from them, it will be for the Clergy to take most sedulous care that they shall inflict as little injury as possible upon the spiritual interests of the population, and cause as few encroachments as possible upon the sacredness of marriage, and the Christian rite of Baptism.

Even here we are treading upon tender ground. Yet there are matters of far more delicacy with which we ought to deal. The ecclesiastical Commissioners have recommended other bills relating to the Church, one of which, not very extensive in itself, but unspeakably important in its principle, has passed the fiery ordeal of the legislature. The rest have been stopped in their progress by a mutiny in the ministerial camp; and exceptions were taken even against the Established Church Bill, because its basis was not of a liberality sufficiently broad for the master builders of the day. On the other side, it is absolutely requisite to say, that disquietudes have increased since our last number was published. Many dislike the very name of Commissions,—that favourite, and

somewhat novel plan, of administering the affairs of an empire: others have objected to the particular constitution of the ecclesiastical commission, because it contained representatives of only one order in the Church; and now, between different orders in the Church, between bishops on the one hand, and deans and chapters on the other, disagreements have arisen for the first time in our recollection. In a word, *the external position and prospects of the Church, with regard to the people at large and the aspects of public opinion; the internal state of the Church, the controversies which will not sleep, and the suspicions which are hardly smothered; the agency of the Church in educating and improving the population; the bearings of modern legislation, such as the new machinery of poor laws, of registration, of territorial divisions and subdivisions, upon the authority of the Church,—upon the parochial system,—upon the Church as a profession;—all these things, and a hundred others, press upon us with their separate and their united weight, and demand, we confess, free and impartial investigation at our hands, if we pretend to give an account of the ecclesiastical and religious condition of affairs.*

If, then, these matters are so important and so urgent, why, it may be asked, do we abstain from entering upon them at once? There hangs upon us, we confess, a kind of hesitation, which oppresses us the more, the longer we reflect. It is not, we trust, from personal timidity: it is not, we believe, from any time-serving or sordid motives: it is not, altogether,—although here is a circumstance which may well bid us pause, and re-consider our opinions—the apprehension that we shall be on some points compelled to differ with persons who claim, and who possess, our utmost deference and respect. But, in sober truth, we are almost overwhelmed by the magnitude, if our view be not mistaken, of the interests that are at stake. We see questions before us involving, more than any other questions can involve, the prosperity of the state, the integrity of the Church, the immediate character which will be attached to the religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and therefore, by a necessary consequence, the whole futurity of the empire, the welfare, not merely temporal, but eternal, not merely secular, but spiritual, of uncounted millions of human beings. It seems to us that all which relates to the intellectual progress of the species is assuming the shape of a problem, which must be stirred and upheaved from its foundation. It seems to us that we are on the eve,—or perhaps in the very agonies,—not of a physical convulsion, but of a moral and religious crisis. There appears before us, not so much a revolution of blood, as a conflict of first principles, a strife of primary feelings and elementary convictions; which strike far more deeply into the roots of human happiness than any merely corporate or social institutions, than any merely political or ecclesiastical arrangements. What wonder is it, then, if we would look again and again at every side of the picture;—if we would endeavour to confirm our sentiments, and assure ourselves that we are right,—if we would take advantage of the months that must elapse ere the legislature at least can take active and overt steps,—before even our obscure and humble thoughts are committed to the world?

Nor is there any inconsistency. We have urged others to speak; because

there are points on which we deem it far better that they should speak than our selves. But hereafter, if the task must devolve upon us, we shall speak very plainly.

So much, however, we would say now. There has scarcely ever, we think, been the period when the prospects of the Church of England, as an ecclesiastical establishment, were at once so bright and so dark as at the present time. Without question, a strong current of feeling is running in favour of Christianity, and of the Church: as witness the amount of the subscriptions, and the glorious rapidity with which new temples are springing up all over the kingdom. The very furiousness of that assault which has been made upon the establishment has recoiled in its consequences upon the assailants. It has aroused the slumbering attachment of her sons, and called more prominently forth the latent heat of their zeal. Neither the march of Popery, nor the inroads of (so called) liberalism and utilitarianism will be able, by their unassisted power, to walk in triumph over our ecclesiastical institutions. But what external enemies cannot effect of themselves, they may do by the aid of internal agitation and internal imprudence. Ungodliness and infidelity will not overtake us, unless fanaticism and error shall have first crept into our sanctuaries. Dissent will not prevail unless the voluntary principle shall first be dominant within the Church itself: unless by the influence of irresponsible associations, and the constant action of many changes, all unity of purpose, and all regularity of discipline, shall be done away. But if the practices on which we have been adverting continue, and spread, then the Church will no more present a compact and solid front to her adversaries; chasms, schisms, separations, will yawn, like gulfs of destruction, widely and more widely; and the foes will rush in, as the soldiers of a Roman legion entered amidst the gaps left in a Greek Phalanx, when the rampart of its spears was no longer even and unbroken. Rather, perhaps, there will be no need of any exterior force: the internal solvents will have done their work; and while men are talking loudly about their success, and full of energy and confidence, and self-gratulation, the entire character of the Church of England will be subverted; and then the Church itself, like a rotten and disunited building, will fall asunder, and crumble on the ground.

There may also be other dangers. With regard to some *Church principles*, a strange degree, either of want of information or want of firmness, is occasionally exhibited among the Conservative members of the House of Commons, and even among the Conservative Peers. For the rest, we shall not deal in violence of invective; but the calmest reason must admit, that the Church has cause to complain of the course—the systematic course—of legislation since the passing of the Reform Bill. Is there a surplus, real or pretended, in the revenues of any portion of the Church? Then that surplus may be applied, at the pleasure of the State, to other than ecclesiastical purposes. Is there a palpable deficiency in any other portion? Then the ecclesiastical deficiency is not to be made up out of the national funds. Is the number of Protestant Churchmen in one part of the empire small, or supposed to be small, in comparison with the number of Bishops? Then, “at one fell swoop,” ten Bishoprics may be extin-

guished. In another part of the empire, is the number of Protestants more than doubled, since the present number of Bishops was fixed? Then the Secretary of State repudiates as a *calumny* any suspicion of a wish or intention, as entertained on his part, of increasing that number of Bishops, on account of the increase of population attached to the Church. On the contrary, much is to be *unkinged*, because nothing is to be *added*. But is this even-handed justice? is this a fair and equitable measure of support rendered to that Establishment, which there is yet a profession of reverencing and wishing to uphold? Again, if, because as far as the Legislature is concerned with the Church, it appears most culpable to give, but most commendable to take away, therefore Churchmen have recourse to personal sacrifices, and raise noble sums by voluntary contribution, what is the inference? "*Behold*," cry our enemies, "*the energy of the voluntary principle!*" and the more we do, the more upon our own exertions an argument is founded against ourselves. We are to be reproached equally for our efforts or our helplessness; and our adversaries are to take advantage of their own wrong.

The prospects of religious education, like the prospects of the Church itself, may be said to be very cheering or very gloomy, according to the aspect in which they are regarded. The plans which have been set on foot, in Coventry by Mr. W. F. Hook, and in Bath by Mr. M. D. Willis and others, for the Christian and general instruction of adults, on that mutual or co-operative system, which is beginning to do wonders in the world, must be gratifying in the extreme to every lover of his country and his Church. On the other side, we gave warning some time ago of the kind of authority which the new Municipal Corporations would attempt to exercise, and the kind of schools which they would attempt to introduce. In Liverpool, as in some other places of less consequence, our anticipations have already been fulfilled. The corporation has exhibited an early solicitude to have schools open to all sects and denominations whatsoever, instead of the Church of England schools which had long flourished in the town. But then, on the part of the ministers and members of the Scriptural Church, how nobly has this revolution been met! They have actually subscribed in a few weeks upwards of £10,000 for the erection and maintenance of new schools, to be conducted on the principles of the establishment. Nor can we consider as the least pleasing feature of the case the answer which was made by Lord Stanley, when his lordship's authority and example were quoted in furtherance of the views taken by the corporation. Lord Stanley states, in a letter which has been widely circulated, "The system which I did recommend as adapted to the peculiar state of Ireland, I never should have thought of recommending as in the least applicable to England:" and again, "I will only say, that, in my humble judgment, all the circumstances which justified and rendered necessary the Irish arrangements for Ireland, are wholly wanting when the parallel is attempted to be established in England. I regret, therefore, that the corporation should have withdrawn their schools from their former management, for the purpose of introducing a system never intended except for the peculiar case of Ireland; and I should be very sorry that my opinion,

however unimportant, should be liable to be quoted in favour of the transfer." To obviate the possibility, his lordship enclosed a donation of £20 for the new Church of England schools. Our own opinion has been more than once expressed, that many and grave questions respecting state education, and some, we will venture to add, even respecting Church establishments, are not questions of universal solution, where one abstract principle will hold good for perpetuity; but must be determined separately, according to the varying circumstances of different countries and ages, and states of social advancement. At present, without looking to Ireland, where the thing is done, we would reiterate our conviction that the system will be most mischievous in England, where it is as yet only in the course of being introduced, only standing, as it were, on the threshold of one policy. Mr. M'Neile, we understand, was one of the most strenuous opponents of the new-fangled amalgamation of all sects and opinions in the schools of Liverpool. How is it then that we find the same Mr. M'Neile standing up to advocate the union of the three denominations in the chapel of Dr. Cooke, the Presbyterian minister of Belfast? Is there no inconsistency between the staunch Churchman of Liverpool and the very lax Episcopalian who made the speech in Ulster? Why must there be so much difference between the same clergyman on the different sides of the Irish Channel; that we are told of Dr. Cooke, "Thanking God that he had had the privilege of hearing a divine of the Church of England preach a sermon, and such a sermon beneath his pulpit?" Do Episcopacy and Church of Englandism form no part of the Bible principles of Mr. M'Neile? Or does he imagine that any real and permanent union can be effected? Alas, Mr. M'Neile can know very little of the tone in which the Scotch Presbyterians still speak, and write, and think concerning Prelacy. We fear that many years must elapse, and a large and bloody page must be blotted out from our history, before there can be any cordial agreement, not between the two nations, but between the two creeds. At present, we are satisfied, English Episcopacy and Scotch or Irish Presbyterianism will have most charity and good-will each for the other, by holding on their respective courses without contact or collision. But more varieties of Faith than Episcopacy and Presbyterianism are to be included, it appears, in the projected "union." Indeed, this "union" of denominations at home appears in our eyes something still more strange than the mixture of all persuasions at Calcutta. Ostentatious coalitions, where there is, and must be, an under-current of disagreement, seldom or never answer.

But there is the common cause of Gospel Protestantism, the common object of opposing Popery. Well; we allow that there is a struggle to be made against Popery: but surely the struggle of the Episcopalian Church, and of the Presbyterian Church, and of the various sects, is to be placed and conducted in a great measure upon separate and distinct grounds. We allow, too, that Popery may become powerful and dangerous: but then we say, that the main element of that power resides not in Popery itself, but in its alliance with dissent, or the voluntary system. It is *not* so much Popery, in its religious aspect, that is dangerous, as Popery, in its political position, aided by Infidelity and Sectarian-

ism. In fact, two very different principles are for the moment combined. If they shall continue together, are we not to oppose them *both*? If, as may rather be expected from the total want of all cohesion and affinity, they shall fall asunder, shall we not inquire which is the more formidable of the two? Now it is our profound conviction, that in the present temper of the British empire, taken as a whole, the more formidable is *not* Popery, but the Sectarian or Voluntary System, blended with that unbelief or utter heedlessness about religion which is almost sure to take its part against that which is at once an Ecclesiastical Establishment and an Apostolical Church. But is it not simple madness to think *only* of crushing the weaker principle, and, by a new mode of operation, encourage what we are pledged to resist, and add strength to what is already too strong?

Hence it is imperative upon us to declare, that while we look forward to the future with a mixture of solemn earnestness and fearful hope, it is a deep satisfaction to us that we know nothing, as to the past, which we have cause to regret or repent. Of the *principles* at least which we have advocated—the unworthiness of the advocacy is quite another matter—there is not one which we would now retract or even modify. Our main object has been to defend the Established Church, such as in its fundamental distinctions of doctrine and discipline it actually exists; not unwilling, as far as we are concerned, to remove encumbrances, and abuses, and blemishes; but still seeking to add rather than to alter, and to supply the deficiencies which time has occasioned, and a rapidly increasing population has rendered visible, rather than to talk of revision and reconstruction. Yes, we emphatically repeat, our object has been to *defend*—not to provoke, or vilify, or attack, or enter upon any aggressive crusade against this or that party of politicians, this or that denomination of Christians—but to *defend*; and to defend what? To defend *the Church of England*; not any abstract form, or vague generality, or airy shadow of Protestantism, but the Church of England,—the Church of Cranmer and Hooker, and the hundreds more, whose names are spells. And in what shape to defend it? To defend it, such as in its *fundamental distinctions of doctrine and discipline it actually exists*. That is, to defend not *an* Established Church but *the* Established Church—the united Church of England and Ireland, its Articles unchanged, its Liturgy unmutated, its parochial system unenfeebled, its episcopal government undisturbed, its character for sound wisdom and godly moderation untarnished and unimpaired: to defend it against all assaults and all assailants, from whatever quarter they may come,—if the Papists assail it, against the Papists; if the Seceders assail it, against the Seceders; if those who profess to belong to its Communion assail it, even against those who profess to belong to its Communion.

Such being our end, as to the best means of attaining it we have never entertained a doubt. We have recommended, we have urged, we have entreated, the *union of all Churchmen*, deprecating the fraternization of particular Churchmen with particular Dissenters, to the exclusion of other Churchmen; and lamenting the infatuation of men who dream of leagues and confederacies, where allies can only be gained by the compromise of principles,—men who

contend for a Church with even a fierce and implacable championship, but whose line of conduct is a practical argument against *the Church*.

To the orthodox members of the Church, we would simply take the liberty of saying, that if a campaign of hostilities be opened, as of old, against them, then even while standing, as they have so long stood, in an attitude of self-defence, they still must change their tactics into a course, not indeed less moderate and less tolerant,—but more resolute, more energetic, and more decided. Unless they are to be first beaten out of the field, and afterwards ridiculed for leaving it, the timid apprehensions of some of their friends, and the cold looks of others, and the zeal-damping hints of more, they must learn to disregard: their attachment to Christian truth, and the allegiance which they owe to the Establishment, must be paramount to all other considerations, whether of private regard or personal convenience. Perhaps, too, if they are opposed as a body, they must seriously think of acting as a body, with a mutual understanding and concert among themselves.

On the whole, our advice to the Clergy still is, if we may venture to advise at all, that they should look forward rather than backward: that, as among themselves, if they can now see the means of real harmony and union, they should not suffer any *past* differences and disagreements to stand for an instant in the way; and as to the things that are without, that they should conform cheerfully and at once to circumstances, which, however novel, have become inevitable, without idle irritation or peevish fretfulness; but that in matters which are not irrevocably fixed, they should cling to the decent dignity of the establishment, and those just rights of themselves as an order which are interwoven with the truest good of the entire community. Our belief is, that the disorders of the Church are, at most, not structural, but functional; that, at worst, the energies may be impeded, but that the constitution is sound; and that, in consequence, there can exist no possible necessity for organic alterations or violent remedies. Our humble recommendation to the ministers and members of the establishment therefore is, that, without shrinking in a sort of fearful disgust from the ruinous words, *Reform* and *Change*, they should yet take as their motto and watchword, *Church Extension*, rather than *Church Reformation*; Church extension on the old, and not any new, basis; the enlargement of the sacred edifice of the Church on the old foundations, and in the old style of architecture,—not the erection, on a new plan, of strange appendages, which could be neither in character with the rest of the building, nor safe, durable, and solid in themselves.

SOCIETIES.

Religious Associations constitute one of the topics from which we now designedly abstain. Only in the case of the most influential of them all, namely, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge,—which is now, in its new buildings, beginning a new career of financial and commercial transactions, and looking to the consolidation of its multifarious undertakings and proceedings under one and the same roof, with a system which would observe the great

law of unity in variety,—we would express a hope that there will be, first, a wise comprehensiveness; and, next, a steadfast regularity of plan; that there will be a classification, or methodized arrangement, of the works upon the catalogue, in order that we may see at a glance what the Society is doing, and what it still leaves undone; and that its *rule* will be the adoption and circulation of books, rather than the original publication of them at its own risk,—rather than that wide speculation in copyrights which will make the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge a great publishing company, sure of odium, as if the religion and charity, which it professes, were sent forth in quest of mercantile profit; but *not* sure of the profit itself; crippling its facilities of diffusing sacred and improving information; and bringing on itself the enmity of individual authors and booksellers, when there are such ample and obvious means of securing their good-will.

GENERAL LITERATURE—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The period of the year between July and October is by no means a favourable season for publication, either with authors or booksellers. We should say, therefore, although there may be many valuable productions which have not come under our eye, that, as far as we know, with the exception of the excellent edition of Hooker, by Mr. Keble, scarcely any work of great value or importance, not reviewed in our preceding pages, has been put forth since the appearance of our last number. We speak, of course, of books published in the interval. Our *past* omissions we very sincerely regret. We lament, moreover, the apparent neglect which may be attributed to us of the Hebrew and cognate languages,—of *continental divinity*,—and of the religious aspect of the popular literature of the day. But, while we keep these matters in view, our present excuse must be, that the state of Church affairs in Great Britain and Ireland is so critical, and the interest excited by the struggle of theological principles is so absorbing, as to leave actually no room for inquiries, which are deserving, in themselves, of the most deliberate and serious attention.

Let it, however, be understood, that when we speak of the paucity of first-rate publications, we are taking the difficult test of standard and elaborate works. Putting the want of originality aside, there is much merit, *as a selection*, in the “*Extracts from the Religious Works of Bishop Newton*;” as also in the “*Compendium of Theology*,” by the Rev. J. B. Smith; and, as a *translation*, in “*The Public and Private Life of the Ancient Greeks*,” from Heinrich Hase. We almost fear, however, that this publication, and, still more, “*Mendham’s Supplement to the Memoirs of the Council of Trent*;” and the learned “*Excerpta ex Frid. Jac. Bastii Commentatione Palæographica*,” will scarcely meet in these days with the meed of success which they deserve. The following also appear to us to reflect, for different reasons, much credit upon their authors,—“*Slade’s Family Readings from the Gospel of St. John*;” “*The Family Liturgy*,” arranged and compiled by the Rev. R. Waldo Sibthorp; the work on “*The Holy Spirit*,” by the Rev. Joseph Wilson, though we dislike the title “*Sacred Pneu-*

matology;" the volume of sermons by the Rev. James Hough, called "The Christian Legacy;" the series of Practical Sermons, by the Rev. C. Bradley; the "*Sermons on some Leading Points of Christian Doctrine and Duty*," by the Rev. John Boyle; while we would say of the *Parochial Sermons* by the Hon. and Rev. S. Best, there are shades of doctrines, or rather, perhaps, modes of expression in these discourses in which we cannot concur; and yet we admire them, on the whole, as being plain, pious, and forcible, put forth in an unpretending manner, and with a manly simplicity of diction.

They who wish to inquire into the disputes which are unhappily disturbing the Church itself, may derive information from a work called "*Calvinism scripturally Examined and Refuted*," by William Houghton. The controversy between the Church and Dissent has been lately carried on with vigour, and talent, and eminent success on the part of Churchmen. "The Edinburgh Church Lectures" we have already mentioned. We may now specify the "*Essays on the Church*," which have reached a third edition; essays valuable in themselves, *exceptis excipiendis*, and more valuable, perhaps, as coming from a Layman; although we think, as they profess to be, and are, for the most part a *compilation*, it might have been as well to state, with somewhat more of particularity, at least in a foot-note, the sources from which the materials were taken. We may also specify "*The Church and Dissent*," the work of another Layman, Mr. Osler,—a work which has some things very good and very well put; but other things, again, where the author exhibits a partiality which we happen to understand; and, in matters which he has not enjoyed the best opportunities of considering, speaks very dogmatically, and somewhat foolishly. But this volume may serve us as a text-book on another occasion. In the controversy with the Church of Rome, many useful publications have also appeared, among which the least imposing, perhaps, in its form, but by no means the least useful in its contents, is the "*Protestant Catechism*," by the Rev. Daniel Bagot. In such publications, which constitute, where they are prudent and moderate, the proper mode of opposing false religion, we heartily rejoice. For, as we have said, "*we are no friends to Popery*," although we have but slight sympathy with Ultra-Protestantism. And thus are we brought, yet most unwillingly, to "Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Gregorii Papæ XVI., Epistola ad Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Hiberniæ; a Letter of our most Holy Father, by Divine Providence, Pope Gregory XVI., to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland: translated from the original Latin, and now first published."

This is the too-celebrated letter which Mr. M'Ghee quoted as the translation of a genuine Bull of the Pope. Now we have no wish to triumph over men who do not agree with us; but we recur to the matter, as it furnishes an instructive warning, and as it is decisive to our minds both of a class of persons and a system of action. The Protestant Association—how happy a beginning of its labours!—sends for Mr. M'Ghee, imports him express from Ireland to Exeter Hall, as their chief speaker, their accredited organ, who is to be "the observed of all observers," the representative of the United Church! "*He stood there at their request.*" The Association, therefore, and its abettors, are of necessity

committed by and with the orator himself. Well: a short time before the meeting, this pamphlet was put forth. We do not accuse its author of any moral turpitude. To constitute a moral fraud, there must be an intention to deceive; but there neither was, nor could be, any such guilty intention in the present case; and, indeed, a man could be only fit for a lunatic asylum, who should utter a wilful forgery, of which the detection and exposure must have been, in the nature of things, both inevitable and immediate. Still, although this kind of literary artifice is by no means unfrequent, we cannot but think the publication one of an unsafe, not to say unfair, character; because it pretended, upon the face of it, to be what it was not. Still less would we impute to Mr. Todd the treachery of laying a snare for his own party. The fictitious Bull was not even meant for a bait, although there were gudgeons voracious enough to swallow it. However, published it was, to Mr. M'Ghee's sore misfortune. What happens next? "*A friend*"—oh, ruinous friendship!—hurries with it, in red-hot impatience, to Mr. M'Ghee at twelve o'clock at night. That friend, then, must have been convinced of its authenticity, although how any man, who had looked at a page of it, could have arrived at such a conclusion, does appear to us beyond all measure astonishing. Mr. M'Ghee does not examine it himself; for his caution is asleep, as it would have been well if he had been. He takes it upon trust, with "no questions asked;" either placing implicit confidence upon his friend—judicious Mr. M'Ghee—judicious confidence,—judicious friend!—or duped by his own fond credulity of any evil as attributed to the Papists. And this unexamined document he actually exhibits, on the next morning, in the very front of his battle; and declares his full belief in its genuineness, and argues upon its contents; and the fair devotees of Exeter Hall turn up their pious eyes; and the sensation is prodigious.

But then comes the *denouement*, and with it the reaction. The absurd exaggeration, when detected, makes men overlook, or distrust, the real perils and mischiefs arising from Popery; while the enemies, victorious upon one point, represent that point as the whole case, and sing their pæan over the discomfited champion of Protestantism, and reason from Mr. M'Ghee to the entire order of the clergy.

Thus, the orator harangues, the chairman sanctions, the meeting applauds, and the opponent triumphs. What precipitancy was there at best, what rashness, what want of common foresight and sagacity; and, alas! in one of the most important causes that ever was committed to the advocacy of human beings! And this, we say, is the fault of the *system*. It is a *system* which allows no opportunity of calm thought, but depends upon sudden and violent impressions. It is a *system*, of which the essence is all haste, and fervour, and tumult, and excitement, in matters which require, above all others, the deepest, the most careful, the most discriminating, the most self-searching and self-distrusting deliberation.

Mr. Todd himself laments "the thoughtless manner in which gentlemen of the best intentions too often permit themselves to be placed in situations of deep responsibility, for which they are quite unfit:" Mr. Todd complains "that they

make mistakes, and are then desirous to throw the blame on others:" Mr. Todd writes, "Could I suppose that any one would think me serious? I never anticipated that any educated man could read the pamphlet and mistake my design; nor can I yet believe that any one of ordinary literary attainments was in danger of being deceived. Mr. M'Ghee, it appears, was in a great measure convinced of the genuineness of the document, and had resolved on the rash course which he adopted before he had so much as read the pamphlet."

Afterwards, perhaps, Mr. M'Ghee may have had his suspicions. But it was the fatality of his position, and of his office, as well as of his mental and moral constitution, that his credulity outran them. His convictions were instantaneous; but his misgivings were all too late. His convictions had travelled post; but his misgivings lumbered up by the waggon.

Yet, we repeat, we have no desire to press hard upon Mr. M'Ghee. His authority is, we should suppose, irretrievably overthrown. His moral honesty can only be defended by giving up for him every claim to a sound, vigorous, and useful understanding. Therefore we shall not dwell longer upon the history of his disaster, signal as it is, and monitory as it ought to be. We shall not trace, in any farther detail, the emissary of the Reformation Society, and the summoned protagonist of the Protestant Association; first quoting as an authentic document, and not only quoting, but putting forward as the main strength of his evidence against the Papists, one of the most transparent—not forgeries—for it was no more a forgery than "*The Pastoral Epistle*," but fictions, that ever was penned; next, when assured of its fabrication, nevertheless praising it as "*the ingenious device of his learned friend*," and recommending it to universal perusal; and then, when taught that the general voice was quite against him, and that he had again committed himself by a letter still more ill-advised than his speech, striving to come out of the affair by a recantation too late to be generous. No: Mr. M'Ghee has been the victim, in this case, of the ardour of his temperament, or of a zeal for Protestantism which has carried him into a quagmire of indiscretion,—and we pity him. But the consequences, we say, extend far beyond the individual. Against the system we do remonstrate, and we will remonstrate, for whatever purposes it is encouraged, and by whatever parties it is patronized. If societies, like the Protestant Association, are allowed, or *supposed* to represent the sentiments and the practices of the Establishment at large; if men like Mr. M'Ghee are to step forward, to this place or that place, upon this platform or that platform, as the authorized delegates of the *Churchmanship* of the empire, and to speak and agitate in its behalf; if, in short, a strong line of distinction is not drawn, and a plain unequivocal protest is not uttered, the Church itself, the whole Church of England and Ireland, will be involved, sooner or later, in inextricable embarrassments, and may be covered with ineffaceable shame.

As a literary curiosity, our readers may be glad to see a specimen of this memorable "*Sanctissimi Gregorii Papæ Epistola*,"—this wondrous charge to the Popish Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, which Mr. M'Ghee must at least have quoted without perceiving the hoax; and where "the Latin has been

suppressed, from a wish to diminish the size and price of the pamphlet," although notes were added much longer than the text. The pretended *Epistola* is treating of the Irish Schools instituted by the Board of Education. It proceeds thus:—

"Remember, Venerable Brethren, that these schools are chiefly of use as they preserve the lambs of Christ's flock from the contagion of heretical schools: and that the instruction of the children of the poor is of itself a matter of no moment—nay, is dangerous, in the neighbourhood of heretics, and in a country where wicked and erroneous books, with mischievous impunity, are everywhere dispersed, to the confusion of all things human and divine (*ad divina humanaque omnia perturbanda*); it is your part therefore (*vestrum est*) to meet this evil as far as possible, remembering the admonitions of the Apostle (*Apostoli monitum*), that men ought not to be wise beyond what is needful, but to be wise to sobriety (*non plus sapere quam oporteat sapere, sed sapere ad sobrietatem*); we recommend, therefore (*hortamur igitur*), that wheresoever it can be done without exciting the clamours of the heretics, the children in your schools be taught little, or rather nothing at all; but that you be satisfied with keeping them as in a preserve, from those emissaries of Satan who go about seeking whom they may devour—(*circumcumbentes, querentes quem devorent*).

"*Probe intelligimus, &c.* We are fully aware, Venerable Brethren, that a great part of the English nation, although they continue as much as ever alienated from the Catholic Church, are nevertheless become indifferent to their own heresy, and have forgotten in a measure the erroneous opinions (*devias opiniones*) for which the original propagators of the schism were so zealous; and that it is to the pernicious indifferentism (*indifferentismo*) which prevails, rather than to any disposition of returning to the bosom of the Church, that you owe the favourable laws which have of late years enabled you to advance so effectually the interests of the Catholic faith. We desire you therefore to cultivate, as much as possible, the good opinion of all such heretics as are thus indifferent to their own heresy, and to endeavour that the heretical members of the new Board (*in nova congregatione*) be of this sort and no other. We know that you are well aware of the use that may be made of the vanity of these heretics, for what St. Hippolytus saith of Noetus, is true of all heretics, especially of such as in this our age affect to be patrons of unbounded liberty of opinions (*qui impudentissime opinionum libertatis se patronos esse gloriantur*), namely, that they are 'inflated, lifted up with vanity, and elevated by the imagination of an alien spirit'—*inflati in elationem provecti sunt, alieni spiritus existimatione elati*. Let them be everywhere praised and celebrated by the orators, who defend your cause, and who are under your influence, as examples of liberality and candour, to the disparagement of their less yielding brethren, who must be everywhere decried as advocates of corruption, and the enemies of all good; thus you will be enabled to secure the co-operation of these vain and conceited men in effecting the more complete destruction of the impious laws which have hitherto oppressed the Church in England and Ireland, and especially in overturning that foul (*tetrum*) schism which, under the semblance of unity and

order, has usurped your lawful rights, and still continues to swallow up the patrimony of the Church.

“ *Singulari gaudio, &c.* We have heard with great joy, that through your influence several of this impious sort of heretics have already been raised to high station, not only in the State (*in regno*), but also in the ecclesiastical dignities of their schism. We exhort you to continue to exert that power, which you have acquired with the counsellors of the King of England, in the same way, and to endeavour especially, that ecclesiastical offices in the Anglican schism be given to men who are zealous advocates for unbounded license of opinions and words (*evagantis opinionum sermonumque licentiæ*) as well as for that censurable, unlimited liberty of conscience (*damnandæ omnimodæ conscientiæ libertatis*), which, as St. Augustine witnesses, is *the liberty of error, and the death of the soul*. In no other way will you more speedily and effectually compass the destruction of the Anglican sect.

“ We are not ignorant, Venerable Brethren, nay, we well know, that there are others in the Anglican schism whom you cannot so easily make use of to your purposes, and who have always been the great obstacle to the restoration of the faith in England. These men, notwithstanding their impious denial of the authority conferred on us by God (*nobis divinitus collatam*), and their open rejection of the decrees of the holy, œcumenical council of Trent, do nevertheless maintain among themselves some delusive show of Catholic unity, pretending, with that false subtlety which belongs to heretics, to reverence the antiquity from which they have departed, and have the audacity to appeal to the Fathers and Councils of the Church in defence of their impious errors. We charge you to be particularly on your guard against this most formidable sort of heretics, whom the other sort have called the high Church (*Ecclesiam altam, seu excelsum*); suffer not the clergy or Catholic laity to come into open collision with any of them, but rather let them be taken with guile, as foxes which spoil the vines (*tanquam vulpes quæ demoliuntur vineas*). The experience of the English Mission has taught you that the most effectual method of dealing with this dangerous and learned sort of heretics, is to excite against them the enmity of their more ignorant brethren, to whom all mention of the holy Fathers, and of Christian antiquity, is odious and a subject of scorn. Divisions and dissensions are easily excited amongst such as have departed from the centre of Catholic unity; and our strength is in their disunion. Let it be your business to excite these wild beasts to devour each other,—let the heretics who still labour to maintain some outward form of Catholic unity and order, be everywhere spoken of as if they were secretly inclined to Catholic doctrine, and willing to reconcile themselves to the Holy See. In this way you will awaken against them the suspicions of their nation; and you will increase the enmity with which they are regarded by their associates in heresy, thus tying these foxes by the tails, that their faces may tend in opposite directions (*ut facies eorum in adversa tendant*).

“ These are the general directions, Venerable Brethren, which we have thought good to give you in reply to your prudent inquiries, according to the wisdom

given unto us by Him, who have set us as watchmen in Israel (*qui speculatores nos posuit in Israel.*) In all other things we leave you, having full confidence in your discretion and zeal for the Catholic faith, to act for yourselves, according to the spirit of this letter (*juxta tenorem harum litterarum*); scruple not to use artifice with those heretical deceivers, whom you cannot benefit, and who, as you know, are declared by St. Augustine, in the decretals of our predecessor Gregory, to have their part with the devil and his angels, in the conflagration of eternal fire; for to no man, who holds not the unity of the Catholic Church, can either baptism or alms, however munificent, or death itself submitted to for Christ, avail any thing unto salvation.

“We ourselves, also, when the government of the Church was committed to our weak shoulders (*humeris invalidis nostris*), had to contend with the lawless fury (*effrænato furore*) of factious men, who sought to raise the standard of rebellion (*signa attollere perduellionis*) and to involve us in the meshes of a foul conspiracy (*teterrimæ conjurationis retibus illaqueare*); we have ourselves seen the triumph of open wickedness (*alacrem exultantem improbitatem*), the perversion of sound doctrine, and the audacious diffusion of all sorts of error, with which you, Venerable Brethren, are in so peculiar a manner called upon to contend. We therefore pray the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, by whose patronage and protection (*quâ Patrono et Sospitâ*) we ourselves have been delivered from the calamities which threatened us, to be present with you also, and by her heavenly inspiration (*cælesti suo afflatu*) to guide you into those measures (*consilia*) which may best promote the interests of the Universal Church, and of the Christian flocks committed to your care.

“*Levemus idcirco simul oculos et manus, &c.* Let us therefore lift up our hands and eyes to Him who leadeth unto wisdom, and directeth the wise (*qui sapientiæ dux est, et emendator sapientium*), that you may obtain from Him by your prayers and ours (*ut supplicibus votis nobiscum exoretis*) this great and most desirable good, and as an augury of this heavenly gift (*cælestis doni auspiciem*), we affectionately impart unto you (*peramanter impertimur*), Venerable Brethren, and to your flocks, our apostolical benediction.

“Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum vi Idib. Septembris, die solemnî Nativitatis B. Virginis Mariæ, anno Dominicæ incarnationis, MDCCCXXXII. Pontificatus nostri anno II.

“GREGORIUS, PP. XVI.”

Mr. M'Ghee has lately betaken himself to the task of writing letters to the newspapers,—a more legitimate method, of the two, for a clergyman of the Established Church to adopt in carrying on a controversy with the Romanists, than being speechmaker-general to the Protestant Association in Exeter Hall. We do not pretend to admire the fierce, vituperative, overstrained style of his epistles; but we have always said that the object of laying bare the mischief of the Popish system is a legitimate object, and that the safest and most legitimate way of attaining it is through the medium of the press. It may be recollected, indeed, that the first blow which recalled public attention to the dangerous ten-

dency of the errors of Romanism, was struck by the animadversions published in this very Review, on the Rheinish Notes, nearly twenty years ago. It is nothing, therefore, to the purpose, that we opposed the tercentenary commemoration of last year. One great reason was our dread, lest repetition after repetition of such celebrations should be urged for ever, in the same irregular and unauthorized way. For it would be just as easy, we think, to find a subject, if men were bent upon it, for a tercentenary commemoration of Protestantism in any of the twenty years previous, or subsequent, as in the year 1835. In the present year, therefore, we have seen without surprise two or three similar proposals in the newspapers; but, happily, they have fallen to the ground still-born. These proposals, however, caused us to turn to the last year's sermons, which were published. One extract, which has caught our eye, it may be instructive to cite, as a specimen of the eloquence which such excitements produce. It is from a discourse by the Rev. T. Mortimer, which appeared in the "*British Pulpit*," at the same time, and in the same number, with a lecture by the Rev. J. Burnet, a Dissenting Minister "in connexion with the Christian Instruction Society." Mr. Mortimer says, "We have considered the Bible as the Word of God, let us now consider it as THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT. If you look at the passage from whence my text is taken, you will see a whole cluster of military terms, all of which a soldier might understand. I remember a pious officer who had served under the hero of Waterloo, who became a minister of the Church of England, and soon after was removed to 'the house, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;' I remember his telling me, when he first began to read the Scriptures, soon after his conversion to God, how exceedingly he was struck with the number of military terms used in the epistles of St. Paul, and particularly with the singular wisdom, adaptation, point, and power with which they were used. If you look at the context, you will find various other parts of the military armour, the shield, and the sword. But the Apostle puts something into the warrior's hand; and what is that? 'The sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.' When meditating on this subject, the thought hastily passed my mind, What if it were possible to gather together the swords of all the great and famous princes and generals that have ever lived; what if we had found the sword of Julius Cæsar, or Alexander, or the great and mighty heroes of ancient and modern times? And what if, taking them up in our hands, we could recount the mighty battles that have been fought, and think of the plains of Marathon, and other famous places where distinguished heroes have fought, and where soldiers have bled? Yet here is a sword for you, Christian people, that would make all other swords look little; it is 'the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.' You ask, What has it done? Ask among the enemy, and they will tell you what it has done. Go to the chief enemy, *the devil*; if he could be honest enough to answer the question, and tell you what it has done in his dominions in putting to the rout his forces, he would have to tell of mighty battles, and deeds of valour and of blood, and of success beyond description."

Such is the *popular* preaching of this enlightened age! Such is the religious

oratory which a great occasion can call forth; and such a divine—who is nevertheless, we understand, a laborious, and in many respects excellent minister,—can tell his hearers, from the pulpits of London, of the time, when “he preached before the University of Cambridge.” The modern officer, who had learnt military tactics under “*the hero of Waterloo*,” selected as being, of necessity, the best judge of St. Paul’s allusions to the ancient armour! And the “*sword of the Spirit*,” compared to the sword of Julius Cæsar! What can we say or do, when men indulge in such comparisons, unless our deeper feelings may take refuge in a smile? unless we may be allowed to discountenance such things as absurdly ridiculous, instead of being compelled to denounce them as outrageously profane?

But we must pass on from an apparent digression, which is yet quite relevant as an illustration, and ought, we repeat, to be useful as a warning.—They who are anxious to hold an even path between extremes, to cherish at once a scriptural and reasonable Protestantism, and to defend it on right grounds, will do well to consult “*Observations on a Work by Mr. Bickersteth, entitled ‘Remarks on the Progress of Popery;’ and an Answer to his Attack on the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* By the Rev. William Brudenell Barter, M. A., Rector of Highclere and Burgclere, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.”

Apropos of “answers,” Mr. Dusautoy may, perhaps, expect that we should reply to the note respecting ourselves in his volume of Sermons lately published. But we have really no room, and very little inclination. It must be a strong necessity that can lead us to enter into private squabbles and disputes in which we are personally concerned. When we are compelled to censure others, it is on public grounds: when we are attacked ourselves, we shall trust to our general course for our defence; and prefer silence, even where we might obtain an easy triumph.

Report of the Pastoral-Aid Society, Anniversary Sermon. By the Rev. Hugh Stowell.

To this Society we shall come in due time. Meanwhile we are content to observe that this, like all similar associations, must be examined, with reference not principally to the published statements or the actual intentions of the immediate founders, but rather to the eventual tendency of the institution itself, as years run on, and managers succeed each other. The Pastoral-Aid Society will either flourish or fail. If it flourishes, that is, if it acquires large resources and large influence, it will gather into the hands of the directors a power ecclesiastically unconstitutional, where they are of the Clergy, and perhaps even more dangerous, where they are of the Laity. If it fails, that is, if after a brief outbreak of excitement it languishes and dies away, it will have diverted into an useless channel so much of Christian attention and Christian zeal, which might have been devoted to more feasible and desirable purposes. The effect upon the youths, whom it will employ as agents, and the mode of employing them, would

afford topics of graver moment than, from the reasons already hinted, we choose now to discuss.

STATISTICAL WORKS.

Letters have reached us requesting that we should correct some gross errors regarding the *statistics of the Established Church*, in publications—certainly not Mr. Gilbert's—which have lately appeared. That mistakes have occurred, either in inadvertence or wantonness, the case of Mr. Norris, of Hackney, already noticed in the newspapers, affords sufficient evidence. But a Review, like ours, we know from experience, cannot pretend to give statistical documents regularly, and at any length. Its business is rather to argue upon them, than to collect them in their naked form. At the same time, of the value of statistics as the true basis of sound reasoning, we have always entertained and expressed the highest estimate. It has, indeed, sometimes struck us, that it would be a work worthy of an enlightened government to present the statistics of the empire, under its official superintendence, as a well-arranged and well-digested whole, instead of waiting till separate returns were demanded, and then furnishing mere fragments of information piecemeal in an inconvenient and expensive shape. At any rate, with the aid of the government, and under the patronage of the hierarchy, the statistics of the Church might be fully and accurately prepared. The best way, we have asserted, we assert, and we shall re-assert, to counteract the mischief of false and calumnious representations, is to have a ready reference to a complete and authentic report. But really if Churchmen are careless about putting forth the facts of their case in a just and unambiguous light, if they choose to postpone to far inferior considerations almost the very first thing they ought to do, they must make up their minds to bear the slanders, and the libels, and the obloquy, which, having the power of averting, they take no pains to avert.

There is only room to add, that among the multitude of single discourses, we have read, with the highest gratification, the Rev. Richard Harvey's sermon, "*The Christian entitled to legal Protection in the Observance of the Lord's Day*;" the Rev. Edwin Sidney's, styled "*The Value of the Church of England as a Keeper of Truth*;" and a most eloquent and effective sermon in behalf of the Royal Humane Society, by the Rev. J. S. M. Anderson.

LONDON :

C. ROWORTH AND SONS, PRINTERS, BELL-YARD,
TEMPLE-BAR.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

A.

Act of Uniformity, observations on it, 347.

Agassiz, his important discoveries in ichthyology, 320.

Anti-Popish Missionaries, their conduct censured, 8, 9.

Apostles, their personal history little known, 226.

Apostles' Creed, identified by some writers with the Rule of Faith, 386, 387.

Apostolical Tradition, nature and importance of, 172—181. 194. 218—Mr. Blanco White's unfounded objection to it considered, 172—testimony of Vincentius Lirinensis, 198—and of Tertulian, *ib.*

Arnobius, his mistake respecting the nature of the evidence deducible from the miracles of our Lord, 354.

Arnold (Dr.), his ill-judged advocacy of Dr. Hampden, 234.

Athanasian Creed, every article in it, concerning the Incarnation, anticipated in the controversy with the Gnostics, 193.

Athanasius (St.), important observation of, respecting the conduct of the Arians, 191.

B.

Baker (Rev. T. B.), animadversions upon his sermon, 423—instance of exceptionable conduct, 424—426.

Baptismal Service, observations on, suggested by Dr. Burton's remarks, 230.

Bellarmino, his observations on the nature of tradition, 182, 183.

Beveridge (Bishop), his opinion respecting the right of private judgment, 390—392.

Blunt (Rev. John J.), Sketch of the Church of the two first centuries, in a course of sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, 113—their excellencies, 129—extract, 130—proves a coincidence between the creed of the Ancient Fathers and the doctrines of the Anglican Church, 131.

Body, the natural and spiritual contrasted, 405—the soul affected by its union with, *ib.*

Bossuet, his observations on tradition, 183.

Brougham (Lord), merits and defects of his Preliminary Discourse to Paley's Natural Theology, 27—obscurity of his style, 29.

Broughton (Archdeacon), his exposition of the views of the Church of Rome, 14.

Browne (Sir Thomas), his works edited by Mr. Wilkin, 162—Mr. Southey's remarks on his phraseology, 164—South's imitation of it, *ib.*

Buckland (Dr.), analysis of his work on Geology and Mineralogy, 297—general character of the work, 296—the author's qualifications for the task, *ib.*—results of geological observation reconcileable with the sacred history of the creation, 298, 299—and with the expositions of the Fathers, 299—statement of the general facts developed by geology, 301—327—advantages of the science, in a religious view, 328.

Burial Service of the Church, Mr. Greswell's Commentary on, 134—anecdote from Bishop Spratt's Visitation Sermon, 136, 137, *note*.

Burial, rite of, amongst the Jews, Greeks, Romans, and Christians, 138—144—inexpediency of burying in Churches, 146, 147—origin of the practice, 147—the Eucharist celebrated at funerals in the Western Churches, 152.

Burton (Dr.), History of the Christian Church during the three first centuries, 209—the author's qualifications for the task, 210. 212—contents and character of the work, 215—its merits and defects, *ib.*—his erroneous opinion respecting James, Bishop of Jerusalem, 226—instances of his accommodation to the temper of the day, 229, 230.

C.

Catholic, origin and import of the term as applied to the Church, 220.

Chances, doctrine of, application of it to determine how far the coincidences of language may be properly regarded as accidental, 369.

Christianity, incapable of improvement by further discoveries, 217.

Church-ales, meaning of the expression, 148.

Church of England, importance of unity, 24—illustration of this, *ib.*—views of, respecting tradition, 184. 186—compared with the Church of Scotland, 204—remodelling of the parochial system, 205—division of labour in, 207—prospects of, with respect to future appointments to the Episcopal Office, 211. 238—242—approaching conflict between the two great sections of, 212—dangers with which the Establishment is menaced, 244—tenets of, respecting the Rule of Faith, 387, 388—not an advocate for private judgment in matters of faith, 388—light in which it has been regarded by mere politicians, 374—leaning of some of her advocates to Latitudinarian principles, 375—inconsistent conduct of some of her members in the present day, 376—prospects at the present time, 486.

Church of Rome not the Church Catholic, 379.

Church-patronage, importance of a well-regulated distribution of it, 249.

Church-Universal, its authority in matters of faith, 379—indefectible in matters of saving faith, 380.

Clergy of the Establishment, their influence, 202—their relation to the middle ranks of society, 202. 206—line of argument to be adopted by them, with reference to the Popish controversy, 375.

Clergy of the Primitive Church, account of their income, and of the mode of raising and apportioning it, 222.

Collect, meaning of the word in the Rubric, 157.

Colquhoun (Mr.), summary of his inferences from the Reports of Parliamentary Committees on the state of Ireland, 3—fairness of his statements, *ib.*

Comprehension, scheme of, difficulty of framing it, 96—only ground of religious union, what, *ib.*—evil effects of it upon the Church, 103.

Conscience, its nature and office, 34—its attestation of the divine justice, 35—remarks of Jeremy Taylor, *ib.*

Convocation of the Clergy, reflections on the revival of, 244.

Conybeare (Rev. W. D.), Theological Lectures, 363—character of the work, 364—author's style, 365—grammatical principles of the Oriental languages, 366—general affinities, 368—application of the doctrine of Chances to determine how far the coincidences of language may be properly regarded as accidental, 369.

Creeds, the legitimate exposition of Scripture doctrine, 170—their Apostolical authority, 185—enlargement of them accounted for, 221.

Cromwell, his character, 346, 347.

D.

Dale (Rev. Thomas), Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, 118—his style, 119—extract from his sermon on the death of the Rev. Isaac Saunders, 119—and from that in behalf of the Pastoral Aid Society, 121.

Decretals, their first appearance and character, 61, 62—their authorship ascribed to Isidore of Seville, 61—Nicholas I. the first of the pontiffs by whom they were quoted, 66.

Dissenters, union of Churchmen with them, visionary nature of it, 93. 97. 345.

Dogmatic Statements of Scripture, our obligation of receiving them independent of a full perception of their meaning, 179.

E.

- Eden* (Rev. Robert), Sermons, 113—his style, 122—extracts, 123.
Education, religious, plans respecting it, 487.
Education, clerical, observations on, 114.
English Episcopacy, Lathbury's history of, from the assembling of the Long Parliament to the Restoration, 329—use of such inquiries, 330—merits of Episcopacy less earnestly pleaded by the English Reformers; this accounted for, 354—the case somewhat altered at a later period, 335—Hooker's arguments stated and examined, 337—the assertion of the divine institution of Episcopacy vindicated from the imputation of presumption or exclusiveness, 343.
English Theology, its superiority, 114—its prospects, 125—merits and defects, 428.
Episcopal office, qualification for it, 238, 240, 242, 249, 475—expediency of episcopal admonition respecting pulpit controversy, 483.
Episcopalian system endowed with an indestructible principle of vitality, 292, 294—testimony of the Sectaries to its necessity, 293.

F.

- Fanaticism*, dangers to be apprehended from, at the present time, 486.
Field, on the Church, his statement respecting the Rule of Faith, 387.
Friars, in Ireland, their meddling activity, 6—their interference with the concerns of the secular clergy, *ib.*

G.

- Geology and Mineralogy*, considered with reference to Natural Theology, 295—statement of the general facts developed by the science, 301—327—advantages derivable from geology in a religious point of view, 328.
German divines, their secluded position unfavourable to their study of divinity, 128—contrasted with the English divines, *ib.*
Gibbon (Edward), inconsistency of his opinions respecting the nature and use of symbols of faith, 178, 179.
Gospel, in what sense "life and immortality" are to be understood as having been "brought to light" by it, 35.
Greswell (Rev. W.), Commentary on the

order of the Burial of the Dead, &c. 134—his remarks on the Lord's Prayer, 158,—and on Predestination and Election, *ib.*—notice of an oversight in his "Dissertation on the Harmony of the Gospels," and in his "Exposition of the Parables," 358.

H.

- Hall* (Rev. Mr.), his selection of Psalms and Hymns, 40—merits and defects of it, 41.
Hammond (Dr.), his opinion respecting the Rule of Faith, 381.
Hampden (Dr.), his remarks on the diversity of religious opinions, 180—and on creeds, *ib.*—animadversions upon his remarks, 181—his misconception of the nature of tradition, as held by the Roman Catholic Church, 182—remarkable passage from his Bampton Lectures, 185—argument deduced from it against himself, *ib.*—case of Dr. Hampden, an illustration of a departure from discipline, arising from the misuse of patronage, 232—Dr. Arnold's ill-judged advocacy, 234—state of the question, 235.
Hebrew language, encouragement of the study of, 115.
Heresy, its nature stated, 188.
Hawks (Rev. Francis), history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, 261—the author's laborious researches, 262—account of the Church of Virginia, 263—his thoughts on the necessity of an Establishment, 281—interesting incident respecting Bishop Moore, 286, 287—his observations on the principle of vitality with which the system of Episcopacy is endowed, 292, 293.
Hooker (R.), new edition of his works by Keble, its great merit, 489.
Howe (John), his life and character by Rogers, 84—is sent to Christ's College, Cambridge, 87—his intimacy with Cudworth, More, Smith, &c. *ib.*—his ordination, *ib.*—Calamy's account of his labours, *ib.*—visits London, and is introduced to Cromwell, 88—is appointed his domestic chaplain, *ib.*—instance of his ministerial faithfulness, 89—his discouragements in the establishment of the Protector, 90—is encouraged by Baxter, *ib.*—Baxter's scheme of Comprehension, 91—Howe's more judicious views, 92—reflections suggested by the present crisis, 93—Howe's friendly feelings towards the Church, 94—returns to Torrington, 95

—injected under the Act of Uniformity, *ib.*—his objections to the Establishment, *ib.*—proceeds to Ireland, as chaplain to Lord Massarene, 97—amusing incident at Holyhead, 97, 98—his controversy with Stillingfleet, 100—and with Tillotson, 101—accompanies Lord Wharton in his travels, 102—draws up “the Case of the Protestant Dissenters,” *ib.*—his answer to De Foe’s pamphlet on occasional Conformity, 105—fallacy of his argument, 106—Howe’s last illness, 107—his death, 108—summary of his character, *ib.*—his style, 109.

I.

Ireland, commotions there in 1830, 7—Dr. Doyle’s Letter against tithes, *ib.*—two classes of Popish priests there, *ib.*—alarming state of Popish disaffection there at the present time, 9—hostility to Protestantism, 10—obstacles in the way of improvement, 12.

J.

Jackson (Dr.), his works recommended, 447.
Jebb (Bishop), his careful examination of candidates for holy orders, 149.
Jesuits, brief history of the various suppressions and restorations of the order, 17—their re-appearance in England in 1793, 15—their designs, *ib.*—their politic efforts to obtain the direction of the education of youth, *ib.*—their settlement at Stonyhurst, *ib.*—their discipline at that institution, 16—increase of their numbers in England and Ireland since 1804..19.
Jews, toleration of by the Greeks and Romans, 215
Jones (of Nayland), his observations on Predestination, 159 [note]—his character of Dr. Jackson, 447 [note].
Judkin (Rev. T. J.) his hymns, extracts from, 417.

K.

Kaye (Dr. Bishop of Lincoln), his remarks on the revival of the Popish controversy, 186, and on tradition, *ib.*
Keble (Mr.), merit of his recent edition of Hooker’s works, 491.
Knowledge, human, its impotence as defence of divine truth, 26.

L.

Laborde (M. Léon de), his Journey to Mount Sinai and the city of Petra, 446—description of the work, 449—account of the discovery of Petra, 451—prophecies concerning it, 452—Account of the author’s route, 454—Necropolis of Petra, 458—account of Khasné, 460—prophecies concerning Edom remarkably fulfilled, 464, 465—account of Sinai, and of the convent of St. Catherine, 468—471.

Lathbury (Rev. Thomas), history of English Episcopacy from the assembling of the Long Parliament to the Restoration, 329—recommendation of the work, *ib.*—the author’s patience and fulness of investigation, *ib.*—instance of erroneous judgment, 333—the author’s incorrect inference from the statements of Hooker, 337.

Latitudinarian argument, statement of it, 174.

Laud (Archbishop), extract from his controversy with Fisher, respecting the authority of the Church Catholic in matters of Faith, 380—observations on the Creed, 386.

Leslie, his opinion respecting the Rule of Faith, 391.

M.

Marriage and Registration Acts, probable operation of, 253.

Maynooth, account of, in 1834, by E. F. O’Beirne, 1—questionable character of the author’s testimony, *ib.*—management of, in 1804, 18—the genius of Loyola becomes predominant there, *ib.*—appointment of the Rev. P. Kenney to the office of vice-president, *ib.*—endowed by government solely for the education of the priesthood, 19—a design formed for the education of laymen there, *ib.*—the design frustrated by Mr. Abbot (Lord Colchester), *ib.*—establishment of Clongowes, *ib.*

M’Ghee (Mr.), recent proceedings of, 492.

Melville (Rev. Henry), sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, 113—his style, 115—his testimony to the growing piety of the University, 125—127.

Metropolis, Fund for Building New Churches in, 200—Bishop of London’s statement, *ib.*—appalling account of spiritual destitution in London, *ib.*—ex-

pected operation of the plan, with reference to the different classes of which the community is composed, 201—plan likely to supersede Home Missions, 206—rule expedient to be observed in appointing preachers, 223.

Missions among the heathen, contracted efforts of the Church of England accounted for, 402.

Mortimer (Rev. T.), extract from a recent sermon of, 498.

Mosheim, his prevailing characteristic, 214.

N.

Natural Religion, and revealed, their limits not well defined, 38, 39—in some cases subsidiary to revealed, 39—contrast between natural and revealed religion, 403—importance of their union, 404.

Nice, Council of, remarks on it, 190—nature of the testimony borne, by the bishops assembled there, to the subject there discussed, 191.

Nonconformity, outline of the history of, 331.

O.

O'Beirne (E. F.), account of Maynooth College in 1834, 1—questionable character of his testimony, *ib.*—substance of his charge, 2, 3.

Ogilvie's Bampton Lectures, superior excellence of the work, 350—extract, illustrative of the advantages derivable from the study of the four Gospels, 351—plan of the work, 353—argument from our Lord's miracles, its true nature and bearing, *ib.*—practical inference from the miracles of Christ, 356—remarks on the parables, 356, 357—on the proper course to be pursued by the disciples of Christ in their intercourse with the world, 360.

Oxford, University of, high religious character of her leading men, 236.

P.

Paley (Dr.), characteristics of his writings, 29—Dr. Turton's description of his style, *ib.*—application of his argument for the facts of Christianity to the proof of its doctrines, 195, 196.

Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ, its idea and design how suggested, 149.

Pastoral Aid Society, observations on its proceedings, 499.

Pastoral Experience, indispensable to the maintenance of a good and efficacious divinity, 128.

Perceval (Rev. A. P.), on the Roman schism, 426—merits of the work, 431—Author's views on the relative position of the *British* and *Romish* Churches, 434—justly charges the Romanists with schism, 435—his remarks on the canons of the Synod of Sardica, 439—and on Wickliff, 441.

Philosophers of Antiquity, their Philosophy contrasted with their Religion, 33—their belief in a future retribution, 34.

Physical Theory of another Life, by the Author of the *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, 403—contents of the work, 404—character of the work, 407—mode of conducting the argument, *ib.*—fundamental principle of his theory, 405—spiritual and animal body; points of agreement and disagreement, *ib.*—instance of extravagance of Scriptural interpretation, 410—author's deficiency of judgment, *ib.*—his argument respecting the necessary dependence of mind upon its union with matter, 411—fallacy of his reasoning, *ib.*—his observations on *time* and *place*, 414.

Popery, its true genius ill-understood in England, 26, 50—mischievous effect of this, 23—seeks an alliance with Jacobinism and Dissent, 26—underwent a sudden change of character at the Reformation, 52—observations on this, *ib.*—moral effects of the Council of Trent upon those who subsequently adhered to the Church of Rome, 53, 82—observations on its power, extent, and duration, 56—rise of the Papal Supremacy, 59, 60—its progress accounted for, 62, 63—aided by the monastic orders, 63—effect of the Papal Supremacy upon the temporal power, 65—consequent depression of the episcopal order generally, 65, 80—effects of Otho's protection, 69—epoch of its full dominion, 73—Reformation under Hildebrand, *ib.*—moral influence of the Papacy in the middle ages, 79—obligations of the Reformed Church, 81—justly charged with schism, 435.

Primitive Church, importance of its testimony, 168—its doctrines necessarily subjected it to persecution, 215—its fulness and purity, 216, 217—its creed deserves to be highly valued, why, 218, 219—its unity, 219.

Private Judgment, right of, observations on, 104, 172—not encouraged by the Articles of the Church of England, 377, 378.

Proselytes to Popery, from what class of religionists they are likely to be drawn, 376.
Protestants, pacific temper between them and Romanists, in foreign states, accounted for, 11.
Protestant Association, remarks on recent proceedings of, 492.
Protestant Episcopal Church, the object of bitter hatred to Popery, 97—inconsiderate conduct of certain of its members at the present day, 376.
Psalmody, public, evils of a want of uniformity in it, 40, 417—Mr. Hall's selection, 41—Rev. E. Scobell's, 417—Rev. Thomas Judkin's Church and Home Melodies, *ib.*—Rev. T. B. Baker's Hymns, defects of the publication, 418.
Pulpit Controversy, expediency of episcopal admonition respecting it, 482.

R.

Reformation, The, proceedings of the Church of Rome upon that event, 52—feelings generated by it, 53.
Revolution, effects of, on the Romanists, 427.
Rogers (Henry), his Life and Character of Howe, 84—needlessly diffuse, *ib.*—his unjust invectives against Archbishop Laud, 85, 86—general character of his work, 112, 113.
Roman Catholic Priesthood in Ireland, its present character, 4—impotent for the repression of civil violence, 5—but powerful for its excitement, *ib.*—two classes of priests in 1830, 7—their conduct contrasted, 7, 8—hostility to Protestantism at the present time, 10—no analogy between the cases of Continental and Irish Catholicism, 12.
Rome, Church of, its genius imperfectly understood in England, 13—its capacity of adapting itself to circumstances, 14—its immutability, 23—importance of an acquaintance with its true genius, *ib.*—authority denied to it by the Established Church, 378—diversity of opinion and doctrine in, 430.
Rome, "English College" there, visited in 1827 by the Pope, 20—privilege conferred by him upon the students, *ib.*
Rule of Faith, observations on it, 377, 385—equivocal sense of the expression, 386.
Romish Controversy, observations on the mode in which it has been, and on which it ought to be, carried on, 427, 429.

S.

Sabbath, acts for the better observation of, 254.
Salisbury Manual, brief account of it, 154.
Sardica, canons of the Synod of, groundlessly alleged by the Romanists in proof of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, 439.
Schism, justly chargeable upon the Romanists of these countries, 435.
Scientific Treatises of the present day, their prevailing characteristic, 28.
Sectarianism, danger of it, 24, 25.
Shiel (Mr. R. L.), his extravagant eulogy of the Roman Catholic priesthood, 4.
Sinan, Mount, ascent of, by M. Léon de Laborde, 446, 468—470.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, proceedings and prospects of, 490.
Socinus, deduced the first notices of a Divine Being from Revelation only, 37.
State, the intermediate, between death and the resurrection, not one of insensibility, 156—argument in support of this from Bishop Beveridge, 157.
Stillington (Bishop), his observations on the infallibility of the Church Catholic, 381.
Stonyhurst, origin of the academy of the Jesuits there, 15—discipline of the institution, 16—intercourse between Stonyhurst and Clongowes, 19.

T.

Taylor (Jeremy), observations of, on Episcopacy, 345, 346—and on the Rule of Faith, 386.
Townson (Dr.), his writings recommended, 359.
Tradition, Catholic, nature and value of it, 437, 439.
Trent, Synod of, its real character, 433, 442.
Turton (Dr.), his work on natural theology considered with reference to Lord Brougham's discourse on that subject, 27—general character and merits of his work, 28—his description of Paley's style, 29—treats Warburton's 'Divine Legation' with undue lenity, 30—36—his contrast of the philosophy with the religion of the ancients, 33—observations on the limits of natural and revealed religion, 38, 39.

U.

Ultra-Protestantism and Popery, necessity of taking a stand between them, 250—gives to the *individual* the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith, 384.

Union between the members of the Church, necessity of it, 489.

Union between England and Ireland, best means of maintaining it, 250, 251.

Ussher (Archbishop), his observations on the infallibility of the Church Universal, 381—and on the Rule of Faith, 386.

V.

Vincentius Lirinensis, his *Commonitorium*, a treatise of great value, 54—his testimony to the importance of apostolical tradition, 198—his rule respecting the nature of matters of necessary belief, 382,

Virginia, Church of, history of, by the Rev. F. L. Hawks, 263—Church established, 265—originally under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, *ib.*—dreadful massacre providentially averted, 266—institution of tithes, 267—want of a *native* clergy, 270—arrival of Whitefield, 273—turbulent conduct of the Baptists, 275, 277, 279—effects of the American Revolution, 277—first Bishop of Virginia, 283—appointment of Bishop Moore, 285—establishment of the theological school of Alexandria, 269.

Voluntary System, mischief of it, 222, 251, 290—erroneous inferences respecting it, 487, 489.

W.

Wakefield (Gilbert) held that there was no foundation for virtue and immortality but in revelation, 38.

Warburton (Bishop), his 'Divine Legation;' origin, design, and character of the work, 30—its merits and defects, 36.

Waterland, the school of, succeeds that of *Bull*, 211.

Watson (Bishop), viewed without dissatisfaction the progress of Unitarian tenets, 37.

Whately (Archbishop), his observations on apostolical teaching, 185—charge to his clergy, 475—perspicuity of his style, 476, 478—seasonable admonitions respecting ministerial teaching, 479—remarks on the division of the Bible into chapter and verse, 481.

White (Mr. Blanco), his unfounded objections to apostolical tradition considered, 172—his extravagant notions respecting the limits of the capability of language, 175.

Wickliff, on the weight due to his opinions, 441.

Wilkins (Dr.), extracts from his Charge to the Clergy of the County of Nottingham, 245, 246.

Wiseman (Dr.), Lectures on the principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, 373—beneficial tendency of the controversy, *ib.*—grounds on which the Established Church ought to be defended against the advocates of Popery, 375, 375—his arguments respecting the Rule of Faith, 377—his remarks on the 6th Article of the Church of England, *ib.*—and on the 20th, 378—texts adduced by him in support of the infallibility of his Church, 383—his erroneous judgment respecting the tenets of the Church of England as to the Rule of Faith, 385—instance of unfair argumentation, 389—unfairly cites Bishop Beveridge as a patron of the right of private judgment, 390—his mistake respecting the tenets of Leslie, 391—and concerning Baxter, 392—extract from his lectures, on the Scripture as a Rule of Faith, 393, 395—his remarks on Matthew, xxviii. 20, 395—fallacy in his reasoning on the words "I will be with you," 397—his contrast of the missionary successes of the Roman Catholics with those of Protestants, 398, 400—contrast between the conduct of the Dutch Calvinists and Romanists in the island of Ceylon, 400.

Woburn Chapel, animadversions upon certain proceedings there, 422.

Proselytes to
religionist
376-

Protestants,
and Ror
counted

Protestant
proceeded

Protestant
bitter 1

derate
bers a1

Psalmody
formit

select
-Re

Hon

Hymn

Pulpit

pal

Ref

Ch

fe

ev.

4

of

I

1

INTROD
- BARNES & CO. NEW YORK, T. 1850

LONDON :
C. Roworth & Sons, Bell-yard, Temple Bar.

